

JAMES T. ANDERSON: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1973-1974

Interviewee: James T. Anderson

Interviewed: 1974

Published: 1981

Interviewer: Mary Ellen Glass

UNOHP Catalog #065

Description

James T. Anderson was acting president of the University of Nevada, Reno from 1973 to 1974. An engineer and an educator, Dr. Anderson arrived at the university in Reno in 1963 to head the College of Engineering. He served as dean of the College of Engineering and vice president for Academic Affairs until 1973, when he was recommended for the position of acting president by President N. Edd Miller.

During the year in which Dr. Anderson served as acting president, he made a number of positive contributions to aid the university. He instituted a new system of submitting biennial budgets that forced better planning; he tried to reach out into the larger community to help people in understanding the university; he presided over the university's centennial celebration in a manner that set a pattern for future observances; and he shepherded it through the 1973 energy crisis, and made the campus aware of the need for energy conservation. Dr. Anderson accomplished more than might have been expected for a short-term assignment as acting president.

Dr. James Anderson's memoir is the second volume in the Oral History Program's series of memoirs of former presidents of the University of Nevada, Reno. The first was recorded by President N. Edd Miller.

**JAMES T. ANDERSON: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR,
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1973-1974**

JAMES T. ANDERSON: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1973-1974

An Oral History Conducted by Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1981
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1981.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Background	1
2. Early Planning in the Office	5
3. Operation of the Office: Personnel, Routines	11
4. Faculty Organizations and Relationships	21
5. Student Government Relationships	23
6. University System Relationships	27
7. High Points, Crises, and Turbulent Periods	33
8. Conclusions	53
Original Index: For Reference Only	55

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

James T. Anderson, Acting President of the University of Nevada, Reno, 1973-74, has recorded this contribution to the University's history. An engineer and an educator, Dr. Anderson arrived at the University in Reno in 1963 to head the College of Engineering. He served as Dean of Engineering and Vice President of Academic Affairs until 1973, when he was selected as Acting President.

During the year in which Dr. Anderson served as Acting President, he made a number of positive contributions which will aid the University in the future. He instituted a new system of submitting biennial budgets that forced better planning; he tried to reach out into the larger community to help people in understanding the University; he presided over the university's centennial celebration in a manner that set a pattern for future observances; he shepherded the University through its first energy crisis" and made the campus aware of the needs imposed by energy conservation; in short, he accomplished more than might have

been expected for a short-term "acting" assignment.

When invited to contribute an account of his year as Acting President to the Oral History Project's *Presidential Memoir* series, Dr. Anderson accepted graciously. Four taping sessions followed, all in Dr. Anderson's office of Vice president for Academic Affairs in August and September, 1974. Dr. Anderson was a pleasant and cooperative chronicler of his activities, recounting his year's work with fair recall and good humor. His review of the memoir resulted in numerous editing and stylistic revisions, but no changes in accounts of events; some material that Dr. Anderson believed repetitive or redundant was deleted.

The Oral History Project of the University of Nevada, Reno, Library preserves the past and the present for future research by tape recording the recollections of people who have played important roles in the history of the region—in this case, in the history of the University. Dr. James Anderson's *Presidential*

Memoir is the second such volume in this series (the first was recorded by President N. Edd Miller). Dr. Anderson has generously donated his literary rights in the *Presidential Memoir* to the University, and has designated the volume as closed to research until March 12, 1981.

Mary Ellen Glass
University of Nevada, Reno
1976

BACKGROUND

[I] came here July 1, 1963 as Dean of Engineering, and was most fortunate that, within the month, by late July, we were anticipating the dedication of the new engineering building, Scrugham Engineering-Mines. Therefore I moved into a total new environment and didn't have to go through the trauma of following the construction of a building. It was already waiting.

As Dean of Engineering, one of the things that I was most interested in doing at Nevada was to encourage research activities and to provide some leadership in graduate programs that were just beginning to get started. Master's level were nicely started, and I could see the development of a Ph.D. before too many years. Finally, there was opportunity and enthusiasm.

When I interviewed for Dean of the College of Engineering, I felt here was a really great opportunity to help get the College of Engineering and, to a limited degree, the entire University into the educational uses of computers.

Back in 1963, the University had just switched from a 650 computers, which was

one of the original computers which I was familiar with, into a second generation computer, which was a 1620. This was about the smallest IBM unit made, very popular, particularly with universities. That had just arrived and in fact at the time, I think the University only had one course on computers at that time. Thus, I felt there was a lot that could be done here.

This did go on for the next four or five years. We established the computer room in the College of Engineering. As we got to bigger and bigger auxiliaries for the 1620, we finally utilized the 1620 up to seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day. We advanced to the Sigma Seven, and we're now at the CDC 6400, which is like trying to compare a kiddy car with a racing car. There's just no comparison between where we are now and where we were eleven years ago. We're in the time sharing mode now, statewide. We've incorporated Las Vegas, the Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and the Community College. And we still have time left over on the computer we have now. It's going exceedingly well.

So as far as one of my goals to assist the University of Nevada getting into the educational uses of computers by one way or another, I think we have arrived.

With respect to the graduate work, the master's degrees developed beautifully, the course offerings, and the laboratory development in the new building. We couldn't fill the new building the first two or three years, but today with the exception of the mathematics department, which is one of the best occupants of an engineering building you could possibly imagine, the building is fairly well filled with College of Engineering activities. We were authorized to offer the interdisciplinary doctor's degree about four years ago.

However, just about that time, the aerospace industry in California and across the country crashed and we had an oversupply of engineers for about four years running. We're now coming out of that with the most sought-after group of undergraduates coming up this year being engineers. Job offers now are—oh, heavens, I've forgotten the figures, but there aren't enough graduating engineers to fill the offers by quite a bit today. So the shortage is definitely over. In fact, the bidding is going up and now bachelor degree engineers with no experience are offered average starting salaries of about \$1,000 a month, which compares rather favorably with all baccalaureate university averages of somewhere around seven or eight hundred dollars a month.

The third thing was research, which goes right along with graduate work. We do have a number of research contracts of various kinds, and we have expanded the sphere of influence in the College of Engineering out into the state. Civil Engineering, for example, in terms of Dean [Charles] Breese—started the cooperative program with the state highway

department, which is highly successful. In fact, the highway department have been very happy with it, and so have we.

One of the other things that came along that I found a great deal of fun and didn't take too much time was a program of writing letters to the parents of girls back before it was fashionable for girls to take engineering. The letters suggested that because of their scores in communication, in the physical sciences, and mathematics, that they might be very well adapted to being successful in taking an engineering degree. We raised the number of girls taking engineering from about two in 1963 to thirteen enrolled about five years later. Thirteen doesn't sound like much, but it was a large percentage improvement over the original two.

I enjoyed the research project that I worked on with Professor Van Tassel; a China Lake research project, developing automatic computer programs for heat transfer problems for the China Lake computers. One of these days I want to go back and do some more in that field. We still have much that still can be done there.

At the same time, I felt that Wendell Mordy was doing an exceptionally fine job of getting the DRI started. Somewhere around '65 or '66, I found that our philosophies were beginning to differ, for which I don't fault either Dr. Mordy or myself. It's just that he began to see the DRI as a more independent creature and I insisted in my own mind that DRI was part of the University. So, I think that, simply put, is what happened.

In any event, I found it most stimulating. Because of this support I was giving the DRI—I'm sure that's why they put me in as the "associate director for the physical sciences." These were the seed money committees. A fraction of the overhead monies went into the four different committees. Mine was physical

sciences. This was another opportunity to promote research and to get interdisciplinary ties working on campus.

In July, 1970 President Miller asked if I would take the job of acting vice president for academic affairs. As I recall, Dean Irwin had just retired as the administrative vice president, the thought being that I would carry this until a search had been made for a full time academic vice president. So I took it on as a job along with my regular position as Dean of Engineering.

About six months later, I found it was an exciting job, so I put my name in for the position. The next year, I was assigned the position of academic vice president, still holding the Dean of Engineering job until such time as a search could be made for the Dean of Engineering. We did not put in an “acting” Dean of Engineering for some time. At the beginning of the past year, July, 1973, we had Dean Breese installed as the Dean of Engineering, and I had the single job of acting academic vice president. During that summer of ‘73, President Miller told me that he was looking at the presidency in Maine and I knew that he was interviewing in Maine. He didn’t seem to be taking it too seriously during the months of June and July. In July, he told me that he had turned down the offer from Maine. He had been made an offer and he’d turned it down. Whereupon, I breathed a great sigh of relief [laughs], because I was not looking forward to any change of that nature.

I felt very positive about President Miller’s administration. In fact, the only reason I took the job to start with (as acting vice president) was to give him a hand. He’d asked on a more or less personal basis if I would do him a favor. Secondly, the only reason I came to the conclusion that I’d take the job as academic vice president was that I liked the idea of working closely with him. Or shall we say, that

was one of the major factors. I’m not sure I’d put my name in if somebody else had been president.

Then about August, he told me that Maine had come back again, and stated that they had reconsidered their list of candidates and were coming back asking him to reconsider and that they wished him to come out one more time (I believe this was August), and to give them a list of whatever road blocks were in the way of his accepting their offer. I don’t know what he responded with, but I assume he wrote his own job description at that point.

He went back to Maine and shortly after his return (which I believe was late August), to the best of my memory, he informed me that he decided to accept. So it was at that point I started gearing up for taking over the acting president’s position in the event that’s what the regents wanted done.

Mind you, we do have an automatic succession here, that if Edd Miller had had a heart attack, for example, I automatically would take over until the next regents meeting. If Edd Miller was out of town, automatically I took over. And we do have an automatic succession—lists which I maintained while I was acting president and which president Milam now has instituted, so we know exactly who has to make decisions if a series of events keep three or four of us off campus, we’re still covered.

So in any event, because I was Edd Miller’s choice for the acting vice president, I assumed the chances were fairly good that I would be asked to be acting president. And so it came to pass at the meeting of the regents in Elko, a recommendation was made by Chancellor Humphrey to the regents and the regents did officially appoint me.

It must have been early September, at Elko. I would be the acting president October 15. One of the reasons for choosing October

15, which I thought was rather nice and I pushed for it a little bit, was that October 12 was the anniversary of “N. Edd Miller Day.” I pushed for the fifteenth or the twelfth if nothing else, just to make it the anniversary of the N. Edd Miller Day.

So obviously then, during the month of September and October, I spent a considerable amount of time finding out from Edd Miller where he kept everything [laughs], and where all the skeletons were that he could remember, and what policies there were that he hadn’t told me about. Obviously, I was quite well prepared in the academic area because I worked very closely with Edd Miller. I was not at all well prepared in other areas (and rightly so) because the areas of intercollegiate athletics reports directly to the president. The entire area of buildings and grounds reports to the president, but as an engineer of course, I had a fair idea of how that functioned. I never worked in the student affairs area and here I would have them reporting to me on an acting basis. Student government itself and dealings with the student leaders was something quite new to me.

EARLY PLANNING IN THE OFFICE

As an engineer, I tried to logically put down all the things that I intended to do during whatever length of time I would be acting president and to try and get some kind of a priority on these things and have some kind of a plan. I don't think it's wise to go to any job without at least some kind of notion as to where you want to be at the end. Now you may never make it, you may never get off first base, but at least you ought to have a goal, and I did dig this set of yellow pages out [refers to papers]. I have in front of me some notes that I took in early October, just before I was to take over the acting presidency.

It was very clear in my mind the overriding priority was to get our needs for resources recognized, get the budget request processed, so that our needs would be properly reflected in the budget request formulas. Examples of this are (we can spend a few moments on them quickly), we had evolved from an historical pattern of just looking to last year's history, adding an increment for inflation and for salary increases and for eight percent more students, and lo and behold, you have

next year's budget request. It was an historical, incremental kind of budget building. Not that that's totally bad. For example, some people look upon this as being a terrible way to do things. I think it's a mixed approach—it has certain virtues, and that is that if historically you decide that a department, a college, and thereupon build up to *the* University, has done a good job this past year, I see nothing wrong with that kind of an approach. The bad thing comes in that if there's no one to be critical, and you just say, "Everything that's done is good," and if everything is just going to be enlarged equally, I think that is the blind approach which, of course, won't work.

I'm not sure how critical we have been. I'm quite convinced that there was a fair amount of critical evaluation of various departments, colleges, and schools on campus and I think this showed up in a variety of levels of support that were uneven across campus. There were some departments that frankly were, as far as I could tell, judged by the administration (and parenthetically I'll say, that's before I got into administration) that were rather well-

endowed with resources, historically, and it continued. There were some others that were rather poorly-endowed. And I think if you look at the ones that were better-endowed, generally they were the ones that were doing more publishing, more creative work, had more graduate students, were the growth departments. Probably the administration of those departments being in the hands of lively, aggressive administrators went hand-in-hand with getting more money. They provided the leadership for the department and at the same time they were going out after more resources, and so I suppose it's a natural consequence.

Well, in any event, the incremental type of budgeting, I believe we've been indulging in for many years. It's probably the simplest form of budget building.

About four years ago, we almost accidentally fell into formula budgeting, via the famous twenty-to-one ratio. We got into the twenty-to-one, and the reasons for that will be found in annual oral histories of several years back.

Twenty-to-one was far too simplistic. It did not take into account the differing costs of classified labor for one thing, the Reno campus compared to Las Vegas as one example; did not take into account the differing kinds of educational activities that are done on the Reno campus versus a newer, younger, University at Las Vegas; did not take into account the differing needs between the highly labor-oriented curricula of medicine and nursing versus the less labor-oriented social sciences and some of the arts (depending upon which ones); and did not take into account the differences between the amount of effort necessary between lower division, upper division, and graduate level work. Although there was a definition in the twenty-to-one of nine credits for a full load graduate and sixteen

for a full load undergraduate. Thus there was a slight differentiation which did recognize that, but none between lower division and upper division. Therefore, there were many shortcomings to the overly-simplistic twenty-to-one which mitigated against UNR and its educational form, of an older established university and the newer, younger university (UNLV) and the still newer, very young Community College. It was inevitable that resources would be strained to the breaking point at UNR.

That was the number one priority. And so one of the first things I did was to propose to the Faculty Senate chairman, JoDeen Flack, who was most helpful, that the budget and institutional studies committee of the Senate, that had just been organized, in response to these budgetary strains we were having (commonly referred to as the "107 committee"—it was the seventh of the Faculty Senate internal committees), be augmented by five administrators (whom I would appoint) so that we would have a combined ad hoc committee reporting both to the president's office and to the Faculty Senate, and be devoted toward doing something about getting a more equitable budget building formula. I spent quite a bit of time with individual members of the committee, trying to be of assistance, bringing to attention of the committee various devices we might use alleviating our various problems. I would, if I have to respond to the question, "What did you do that was good?" say that was the one thing that I felt I did, or at least assisted in.

We finally developed a budget request which is built upon a much more sophisticated formula, and which gets away from the problem I mentioned earlier, of differing costs of labor between the north and south end of the state. That alone is worth \$330,000 a year to this campus. I feel all of the things

that were done by the 107 committee were helpful. There were about fourteen different recommendations when it was all over with, all of which I think helped to equitably respond to the varying needs of Community College, young university, and old university. I feel that we were very fortunate that we didn't wind up with a serious disagreement with the other units of the System. I think Las Vegas was particularly generous in forming an alliance with us, joining forces on this. And I think Community College is to be complimented for not objecting very strongly. They, of course, felt they had to object on a few points, and they did get a few things changed in their favor, but all things are compromised to some extent. I don't believe we'll ever have the perfect formula, but this one I feel is so much better than anything we ever had that I feel very good about it indeed. So I think that was my major accomplishment.

This had been, I felt, one of our most difficult problems over the last, almost four years. There are some other things though, I'd hoped to accomplish.

In looking over this list, almost a year later, I find that my other items of urgency that occurred to me at that time were: Number One, off-loading myself so I would have enough time to do the things that I felt I would have to do, and still maintain my sanity. And so I had about seven various committees and boards that I had listed to release the chairmanship of. A number of these positions, for example, that I listed: I was the campus administrator officer for the disciplinary code. Well, that's impossible when you're president because obviously, you can't be judge and jury at the same time, and so that was one that I *had* to get someone else to take. I was chairman of the Residency Appeal Board. Well, again, judge and jury, you can't do that. The Residency

Appeal Board makes recommendations to the president. So I managed to get someone else to take that. Chairman of the Academic Council, I thought about that awhile, but there is precedent for the president being the chairman. Armstrong and Miller both did it. It was Miller who decided that maybe the academic vice president could be the chairman and thus assist the president's office that way. Well, rather than put somebody in as a temporary chairman, I merely continued that one. Chairman of the Computer Users Board on campus. Well, that was one I just couldn't do justice to any more, so I asked that board to find itself a new chairman. Chairman of the Computerized Registration Committee, that one I passed along. I was the University of Nevada representative on the System computer board, so I got off that one. I was the UNR representative on the System Articulation Board and that was another one (those last two in conjunction with Neil Humphrey) I divested myself of.

And then there were a number of positions out in the state that I gave up my administrative position with such as: one I can remember now, but I was the vice chairman and I have been for some years, of the Nevada Vocational Manpower Advisory Board. That's a state board appointed by the governor. I stepped back in that one to a membership, warning everyone that I wouldn't be able to go to too many of the meetings during this year.

Then my next area of concern was to get outreach into the state. I noticed I had listed things like, "Set up a lunch with the local law enforcement and campus security head." Well, I did that. I found that this gave us a good working relationship which, happily, there was no crises that we had to draw upon this, but I felt it strengthened our ties with the sheriff's department, the highway department, the narcotics division. I felt that

as a result of this, they felt kindly disposed toward the University. They seemed to be very happy to be singled out as partners in our efforts in the state.

Another one was the pre-football game. But I notice, with interest now, that I had this all written out [laughs] long before I did these things; it's interesting to find out how many of these things I did.

One of the things I was going to do, I never got to. And that was, "Set up visits with people in the state," meaning out-state; deliberately go to Austin or Tonopah or Las Vegas and have some meetings either with service organizations, Rotary Clubs, alumni groups, or whatever. Time just didn't permit me to do—at least I couldn't find the time to do that.

I tried to set up luncheon meetings with student officers. This didn't work too well. The president of the student body wanted to do this, but I found that when I did it, it was just most difficult to get the students to schedule it. So I had a very small group in the president's office there to talk to. But this was an outreach onto the campus.

I remember trying to establish connection with the various minority groups. There was, I learned, a Chinese students' association, and a Black Student Union, of course. There were various others. I think there was a Chicano student organization. I asked the dean of students to set up a luncheon inviting all of the presidents of those organizations. This was a complete bust. We just had to cancel the luncheon. We just couldn't seem to get them to respond to dropping in. As it turned out, we didn't have any problems. But I did feel a little badly that I couldn't at least talk to them and find out what their problems were, and if there was anything the university might be looking forward to, to giving them some form

of assistance. That was one of the failures. At least we tried.

I wanted to have a series of presidential "coffees" [laughs], but I just ran out of—I ran out of steam on that one. Edd Miller had tried this with using various groups on campus which I thought was highly successful. Somehow, that one didn't work, 'cause I just didn't get to it.

I also see that I had written and I'd forgotten that—in fact, this became kind of a tradition with the Academic Council—I decided that we were so involved with the decision-making process of the Academic council that we never had time to just exchange views on anything. So I deliberately set up with the Academic Council regular meetings in which we did business—the business everyone's acquainted with, such as consideration of the various types of things that Faculty Senate considers except from an administrative point of view. But then every other meeting, I'd set up what I called an "information meeting," and we did not have an agenda. I would have a few key ideas that I'd throw in the pot. These weren't necessarily long meetings—an hour, hour and a half. I found out it was a good way to brief the deans and directors and therefore, they were well informed and in turn, could brief, and before things started festering, quite often I would get feedback from them. Or something that was very timely, by the time the next Academic Council meeting came up, would be yesterday's mashed potatoes; [it] worked out that they would have whatever it was on a very timely basis.

This, of course, sounds like well, good lord, we're just getting more meetings. But I felt that this was a way of multiplying my energies; instead of telling fifteen different people on fifteen different occasions the same

thing, I could get them all together and at least every two weeks, I could be telling them whatever I felt they would be interested in, that the faculty would be interested in, or the campus in general. Well, we did it all during the nine months' period. We may do it again this year. (I haven't talked to president Milam as to his desires in this area.) But I did sound out the group from time to time just to see if they thought this was a waste of time, or what. And I seemed to get some fairly genuine enthusiasm for this informational type of thing, as long as we didn't meet for the sake of meeting. That's deadly. I do think it helped the communication process on campus, at least at the administrative level.

I had one listed here that—again the outreach on campus—and that was I see I noted, underlines here, “Get every member of the Academic Council to put in writing their suggestions for improving anything they could think of about UNR.” I got one of those. That idea didn't work at all [laughs]. So I guess on balance, you win a few, you lose a few, and some of 'em didn't amount to much, really.

I had a number of routine things regarding the office, which are not too important. I think every president wants to put their own stamp upon the office. The major thing I did was to brighten it up with white paint and to get rid of half the books and open up the office a little bit as far as that's concerned.

I've already mentioned, I had one page devoted to faculty here in which I did do—I told them that I would be available for visits to faculty meetings. And again instead of talking just to one faculty member, why not talk to the whole department, or the whole college, depending upon what their preference is. I did a fair number of those. They took me up on it, and I felt it kept me in touch with at least some of the faculty concerns, also gave me

a chance to explain why I was doing certain things the way I was doing 'em.

Tours of the department. I tried that, but they didn't seem to want that, the tour idea. I don't know why. They liked to sit down at a table, but not tour.

You see, I had a whole list of things that I'd written down in early October as to what I needed done by this office [academic affairs] to make sure that I would have continuity here. This is the list I used then and subsequently to go over with Ralph Irwin, who did a very excellent job. He came in and certainly made my job tolerable, trying to be acting president.

I had some things about the alumni and legislature that I thought would be interesting to do. And I did. I had the alumni officers for a presidential lunch. This got us off on the right foot, I think. They seemed to like that. I was going to make up a slide show for alumni and legislators, but that's one that just didn't—time didn't permit me to get into that. I wanted to have, oh, like a tour of the campus via slides. And a little talk about what we were doing at UNR that I could give to alumni or legislators. As I say, I never did get to that.

[Consults notes] I see I have still another page of office routines here that—very minor things that—most of them I did, and some worked, and some didn't.

I started a list of “influential citizens,” and I see in retrospect now that I didn't get very far with it. what the heck, everybody's influential, so [laughs] that particular idea didn't get very far.

I have a page set aside for the Chancellor's office and the one thing that I wrote down at the time was to have regular meetings and probably one hour per week. Well, it actually turned out regular meetings of two hours per week. So I think that one was quite significant and that was the only one and it

worked very well indeed. As I said before, I felt the relationships between the president and the chancellor should be very close, considering our dual interest in making sure we communicate properly to the regents, so that is the thrust of that. Whatever's necessary, to go together as a team to the regents.

Well, there is my retrospect analysis of the yellow pages I wrote in early October of what I was trying to cover. That really does cover thoughts and plans for the year. I think it finishes it off. And it gets us into the beginning of the next area, which is operation of the president's office.

OPERATION OF THE OFFICE: PERSONNEL, ROUTINES

President Miller looked upon this as being a great challenge. In fact, President Miller for eight years had been the president of the *old* university watching the rising, *new* university coming in, and had lived that experience rather deeply, and in going to Maine, he became the president of the *new* university that was growing up in a state where an *old* university was in existence. And he was rather looking forward to putting that other hat on and knowing just what could be done to assist the new university. Of course, Edd Miller left, I think, with the good wishes of the great majority of people that he worked with at this institution. My personal reaction was one of sorrow that he'd decided he'd outlived his stay here. He felt that eight years was plenty; in fact, five was more like it. But he felt that eight years was more than enough for any president these days. He'd done just about everything he'd hoped to do, felt that he'd reached the end of his—well, there's diminishing returns of contributions you make in any job. But I still felt a sense of loss because I felt rather strongly his involvement of students and

faculty into the decision-making process of the University was something that I for one strongly supported.

Motives in accepting the appointment—? Well, I don't know if I had motives. I had reactions like sheer terror, and [laughs] inadequacy, and oh, dear—. I looked upon it as—I had been here for ten years myself, and one of my motives was that I thought there was some things I could do. I had some pretty definite ideas, like the one about the budget that I've already discussed. That was one thing I wanted to do very much and I felt as acting president, I could do that better than as academic vice president. Number two, I guess it's just like the mountain; it was there and I thought I'd like to give it a try, have the experience of trying it on for a year or nine months. I did have misgivings though, about whether there were just going to be enough hours in the day to do all the things, to learn everything I would have to learn, to see all the people that I really should see. And whether I could still maintain rapport with the campus; that was a misgiving I had. That was a negative

side of it. I felt that as vice president, I had pretty good rapport; I had enough time to establish it and I enjoyed that part of my job. I knew that was going to be an aspect of the job. I just—well, I wouldn't have the time. And as it turned out, there wasn't time.

I knew also that there would be formal functions that a president should go to and I took that very seriously. So did my wife. So I went to every University activity that I was invited to that I could schedule. This kept me busy. We found ourselves going to as many—I think one night we hit some kind of a record, we went to six different activities after dark. And it was just going as hard as we could from one to the other. But normally on a weekend, oh, it wasn't so bad really—about two per night. usually there'd be some kind of an athletic event or a musical event or a drama event (which I thoroughly enjoyed; this is all very enjoyable if there's three of you—you enjoy all this. There just isn't enough of me to enjoy all that). So we'd go to all these things and then we'd go to all the formal functions that you're requested to go to. And I know as having lived around (all my life has been devoted to universities), that if a department or a unit on the university asks the president to join them in something, they feel very strongly and they'd really like it if he could. Divorcing yourself from the personality of the president is just the office—is showing up at your function. So knowing this exists, we tried very hard to do that.

So that was a negative thing. I knew it would have to be done, or at least I felt that if I took the job I would have to do it. We did it. Much of it we enjoyed, but I must say I wound up terribly tired at times, and kind of exhausted and every once in awhile kind of wondering whether I was going to make it.

I can't think of any other motives at this point. I think that states it fairly simply. I did

debate for a considerable while whether I ever want to take a job like that on indefinitely. Well, I could do anything for six or nine months. You can put up with anything for a limited period of time, if you know there's an end to it. So I consoled myself for the first three months that there is an end to it. At the end of about two months, I think it was—about two months—somewhere about Christmastime, some body put my name in. I'd been asked whether I wanted to be a candidate. I debated long and hard, and I decided, oh well, you only live once. That was a quiet period. It hadn't been too bad a week, I guess, and I thought, oh, well, maybe I could take a swing at it. What the heck, you never know till you try. So I went ahead and put my name in.

The motives there were really mixed. I guess the only motive I had for putting my name in was I'd been here sufficiently long that I thought I could do—well, I would be in a position to do a number of things for the University as president, because I knew how to get things done around here. I knew the mechanics of the University quite well. And maybe as president I could be doing some things with respect to the legislature, and with respect to the alumni, and athletics and so on, that normally—that I couldn't, and wouldn't be in my purview as academic vice president. Well, anyway, that's about all I can think of in the way of motives. They really weren't all that startling. It's about what you'd expect.

The setting of priorities again. I had two other priorities. One was that I felt that I wanted to get more people on campus, and I wanted to do it in more informal ways. So I encouraged the alumni. One of my deliberate plans was that there were host funds available; I got my hands on those. And I encouraged all the deans. The deans up till this year had been getting through Edd Miller's help, about

a hundred dollars a year host money. Now, that normally would mean a dean could throw a get-acquainted party some time in the fall of all the faculty in his or her college, could take somebody out to dinner a couple of times, buy some coffee for a couple of visitors, take the advisory group out for a lunch, and that was about it. That's about what we covered. I encouraged the deans and said, "Now here's your chance. We have some host monies here and if you want to invite any group to this campus, start up a new advisory group for the college, for a department, if you want to invite a group of legislators, if you want to invite a group of interested citizens, I don't care who it is, I want to get people on this campus, and I want to have the chance in an informal, relaxed manner to let them get to know us as people, and not as those 'longhaired professors on the hill,' or 'stuckup people on the hill,' or whatever the characterization is."

A number of the deans took me up on it, and we had a number of lunches. They were inexpensive, just box lunches. We had the dining commons put together a sandwich, and an apple, and a cookie, which is about all it amounted to, and coffee. It didn't cost that much. And we had legislators in, in various groupings. We had friends of the University of different kinds coming in for lunch.

I had a fairly large lunch with all the northern legislators before a football game, with all the deans, which seemed to go over pretty well. That was the kind of thing—get them all to come here for the game, bring them in early for a bit of lunch, and get acquainted. That particular lunch was in the Anderson building which was new, which most of them had never seen. In fact, some of them didn't have an inkling it was back there behind the hill. We provided them and their families with good seats at the football game, which they seemed to appreciate.

I planned to do a number of things like that for basketball games; unfortunately though, Elizabeth, who handles much of my logistic side of this, had major surgery which put her out of action, totally for three months, and she still is coming out of it now. Then I got so busy, I couldn't do much more than just trying to get through the year. My plans for the basketball season didn't materialize.

Anyway, in the same fashion, I tried at least once a week to have lunch with either individual or small group of individuals, who I felt had close connections with the University or relations with the University, or were influential. I managed to get through ten of those and then I just got so busy I couldn't do that any more. This was a high priority to try to open the University to as many people as I could in different ways. Actually had them in the president's office, for example. We had box lunches brought in and had people for lunch up there.

A large number of people had never been in the president's office before. Never occurred to me. It's kind of off limits. You don't get in there unless the president's calling you on the carpet, or unless you're so upset about something that you have to go to the presidential level to get it solved, which I think is pretty poor business [laughs]. So I tried to open it up.

I also tried to fix the president's office so it was refurbished. So I got a new paint job on it, had the air conditioning fixed so it didn't make so darn much noise, and had the drapes cleaned. We painted all the woodwork white, lightened it up. It was just far too dark for my taste. We got rid of half the books on the shelf that were just window-dressing anyway. Tried to lighten up the place and then deliberately use it for as many activities as we could. For example, when we had various awards, we would bring people into the president's

office and take a picture in there. I even had groups of people, as many as thirty at a time, for awards of various kinds, rather than do it elsewhere. Figured the office was the place. Tried to use the office as a setting for getting acquainted, letting people get acquainted with the University.

Plans for office operation? It's interesting psychologically—I knew that I wasn't going to have time for my usual thirty-minute or one-hour appointment, so I made myself available, in writing and orally, that I would be available if any department wanted to invite me. If any school wanted to invite me, I would come in and visit with them and try to answer any questions I could, or listen to what their problems were. I had a number of very interesting meetings with a number of groups on campus, of all kinds. I realized that was one way that I could maintain rapport and maintain relationships with individuals, was by spending my time with groups of individuals. If I were spending thirty minutes, I would spend it with ten people instead of one or two. But the interesting thing was that I told everybody I was going to set up fifteen-minute appointments because there just wasn't going to be time for any more. But if anyone wanted to see me on an individual basis, I just could not give the usual half hour or hour.

The result was that compared to Edd Miller, I had very few office visitors. This is fascinating when you consider that I probably had fewer visitors as president than I had down here, as academic vice president. And so if you consider that Edd Miller had a certain number of appointments, and I had a certain number of appointments every day, that probably by the time he left and I went upstairs, that was cut into one quarter of what it was before. And most people were highly organized. They'd come in, they'd say, "I must know (this or that). This is the problem. What

do you say?" And I could almost always give a quick yes or no, or, "What's your telephone number?" as a result—a number of fifteen-minute appointments did develop. Obviously, though, if there was a subject of any consequence, a fifteen-minute appointment just isn't going to do it. But people were very good about it and I found that they truly tried every possible way to solve the problem before they'd finally drag in through the president's door [laughs] compared to what I'm sure the situation was when we had both a president and a vice president available with open door policies. I still kept the open-door policy, but we did have to stack 'em up a little bit due to the— well, just the plain time pressure.

It was about that time also, the question arose on campus, well, who's going to take care of the vice president's job? I considered various people, and various possibilities. The vice president's job is one in which if you just take say, the average faculty member and say, "I hereby dub thee vice president," they could be real great faculty members, but it would take about—well, my estimate was at least three months to really get hold of the ropes and find out what was going on. And that would put a load on this office, as well as a load on me. And the other thing was that if I did take say, one of the deans, it wouldn't take as long, because the deans have more relationships with the vice president's office, so they at least know part of what to expect or what goes on. But there if I do that, I'm starting to weaken my deans' structure on campus. And playing musical chairs just isn't a very good game administratively, anyway, although we do it from time to time because we have to.

I consider myself exceedingly fortunate that Ralph Irwin was available and was willing to come out of retirement and up to the limit of the time that's available under the

retirement rules. He did a magnificent job of really getting in here and doing the everyday duties that have to be done in this office to make this office function in line with the president's office. And he could do it from the first day on the job because as administrative vice president, he had done this. So I really brought him in as administrative assistant to the president, which is one of the aspects of this job of the academic vice president's office, but not all of it. And I owe him a great debt of gratitude that he was here and I knew that any time I saw his initial on something I could count on it being done thoroughly and done right. Well, that was a great, good fortune that I had as far as getting the office operation set up.

As far as the office operation of the secretaries, upstairs, president's office, I again was most fortunate that I had Jean Baldwin who knew just about everything there was to know about operations, and had a very good memory on what had been done, and could give me the background quickly. She was excellent. And that does make a tremendous difference when you're trying to cope with a new job under circumstances like that. I think that covers the office operation.

Faculty and student organization and relationships, I've already talked about. I made myself available to any group and there were a fair number that scheduled me in and we had some real good exchanges of ideas, which I thoroughly enjoyed and I got some inputs from them. I also used the Faculty Senate and the executive committee of the Faculty Senate a great deal, as input on decisions that had to be made. I took the position of notifying the Faculty Senate chairman of just about everything that was going on on campus, short of extremely personal personnel items, which obviously the Faculty Senate chairman didn't need to know. I felt that for the Faculty

Senate chairman to be effective, that the Faculty Senate chairman darn well better know what's going on and know the facts, as best I could give them.

I had regular meetings every week with the Faculty Senate chairman. I also had regular meetings every week with Chancellor Humphrey. I felt that communication is essential; we all talk about it a lot, but I was ready to be damn sure that we communicated in both directions. I found out it was most helpful, because quite often Neil Humphrey was in a position to help the University because of his background. I briefed him on a number of things that were happening and would eventually get to the regents for consideration. He was most helpful. In fact, I should say everybody was helpful; they could have made it miserable for me. It was very nice to get the support.

Personnel of the office. Mrs. Baldwin (I think I mentioned this), it was really her experience again that made my job tolerable. I could ask for anything. She knew where it was. She knew what the background was, and if she didn't know it instantly, within ten minutes she could come up with it. She was very good at also reminding me and alerting me that certain things were going to happen and [laughs] make sure that I covered certain areas. She was very good about all of these things.

I found and have become aware that when you occupy positions such as a president, in all innocence you may express an interest in something and the next thing you know, you get feedback that you've thrown the department into a complete flap which wasn't your intent at all. The example of this occurred shortly after I became vice president for academic affairs, I became quite irritated with the rugs in this office which if you scuffle a little bit, you get one magnificent electrical

shock from everything metallic you touch. I'd heard that there are antistatic compounds or antistatic treatments that you can give the rugs. I was hoping to find something very simple, something that would cost about a quarter, and I could buy ten gallons of it, and I could spread it on the carpet and get rid of this problem. And so just in a mood of curiosity, I asked my office, "Could you please call up Home Ec and find out what is the best way to get rid of this static problem in the office." I promptly forgot about it.

About three days later, through the back door, they said, "What on earth are you trying to do? The whole Home Ec department is in an uproar trying to find out what this substance is that you're asking about!" And it came to me then that I'd gone about it in much too forthright a fashion, thinking it just a simple little thing and if there wasn't such a compound, just tell me. But they assumed that I was testing them, apparently, and this was somehow the acid test, and they were going to respond somehow.

Well, as soon as I found that out, I got right on the line to Dean Tripple and said, "For heavens sakes, don't worry about it. It's just if you happen to know of something, fine; if you don't, forget it. It's not all that important. I thought I would use the resources of the University to try and solve a very small problem, and I'll survive without it." By the way, subsequently I did find the compound. I have it in the office now, and I no longer have the static electricity problem.

Well, in like fashion, when the energy crunch came along, one of the things that happened was that I felt that if anyone on campus ought to do without (and I'm talking about either heat or air conditioning or lights) during this period, that the president's office ought to provide some leadership. So I didn't turn my lights on until it was absolutely too

dark for me to see anything. I did not turn the air conditioning on until the sweat was just running down everybody in the office. In the winter time, I set the thermostat at fifty-eight and I hung in there in the mornings, because I tend to run warm-blooded anyway, so this was no great sacrifice; because I don't respond to things like that, it is not important to me. I'm not trying to say I made big sacrifices, but if I'm asking other people to put up with lower thermostats, mine ought to be as low as, or lower than anybody else's on campus, or in the summer, higher than, for air conditioning. If I've been asking them to do with less light or remember to turn the lights out, I'd better remember to turn the lights out, too. It's only fair.

So one of the things we had up there was a water cooler. I'd inherited that water cooler and it was plugged into the wall, and every once in awhile (this was in a little closet), I'd go down the hall and I'd hear this water cooler humming away. And I thought, well, good heavens, I don't need any ice water. In fact, I'd suggested we unhook all the water coolers on campus. After all, the water is cool enough out of a faucet, anyway. And I know these little compressors, they all take electricity, and so this will be part of our contribution to the energy shortage. So, without thinking, I just pulled the plug on the water cooler. Well, this caused great consternation in the office, you know, 'cause everybody was afraid to say anything to me about it. The way I found out about it was, Ed Pine, the vice president for finance, [laughs] finally it got to his ears [laughs]. Lord knows what route it took; it must have gone all the way around campus in some circuitous fashion and got back to his ears. Ed Pine came in to see me and said, "I want to talk to you about a problem in the office."

"Well, yes, what is it?"

“Well, it’s the water cooler.”

[Laughs] And I thought, what on earth is that? I just

“Well, did you pull the plug on it?”

“Yes, I did. We don’t need cold water around here.”

He said, “The thing you apparently don’t know is there’s a little refrigerator with it, and all the secretaries in the office use that to keep their lunch cool and when you pull the plug, they no longer have a place to put their lunch, and they’re very upset about all this and,” he said, “I really, as head of B & G, and being in charge of all utilities and so on, I would urge you to go ahead and allow us to plug it back in again because the amount of energy we save just isn’t worth all the trouble this is going to cause us” [laughing].

[Laughs] So I said, “For lord sake, I had no idea there was a refrigerator on that thing. I’d never—there was a door, but I’d never looked in there.” So we plugged it in immediately. I thought it was making a sacrifice and here I was making the secretaries bear the brunt of that particular action.

In a sense, a number of these things I talked about were to get more efficiency and to spread the position of president around as much as possible, the principle being if you’re going to say something, you might as well say it to twenty people as to one person. so I tried to use that and was quite successful, I think. I tried to talk more to groups than to individuals. By the way, that’s not my style. I much prefer to talk to an individual, but I learned to try and talk to groups as I would as individuals, as an individual.

Another thing was that I found that I had to depend greatly upon the good judgment of everyone sending me a recommendation. One of the things that president Milan is finding right now that I found to my utter amazement when I got up there, that an unbelievable

amount of time must be spent by a president signing things. And President Milam has just now mentioned this at least twice a day for the last week. And all I can do is sympathize with him. I am going to work on legal methods to help President Milam reduce the amount of signing he does. For example, last night, he said, it’s averaging two hours a day. Now this is just unbelievable. There are legal requirements, for the final signature must be the president’s, the way we set our structure up here at this University. unfortunately, it’s grown like Topsy. I think what’s led to this is, in the old days when you had one hundred faculty, it wasn’t that much of a burden to sign all the contracts. What we tend to forget now is that we have six hundred now. In the days when you had a hundred, well, it wasn’t that much of a burden to sign all the evaluations. Now again, six hundred. All the transfers must be signed by the president. I’m sure, every time that somebody asked the question, “Who has to sign this to make it legal?” they always boost it up one; they keep escalating the level at which something becomes legal. It’s the safe thing-to do. It’s the conservative thing to do, as far as sorting things out after it’s all over, and I think everyone feels more comfortable if there’s always someone after them signing, because that covers them. So it’s a human failing. The organization, I’m sure, responded to human desires to be covered and the human desire to be sure that everything’s being done right at the highest possible level.

That’s fine until you are in a position of having to sign all these things- And they are innumerable, the things the president has to sign. As I say, president Milam is finding it unbelievable. I found it unbelievable, and I think whenever anyone would ask me during that period that I was there, “What’s a typical day like?” I would always start out with, “Well, first you spend most of the time just signing

things,” and I know most people gave me a blank look. And they had no idea what I was talking about. There’s just tons of it. If you’re gone for a day, I swear, there would be a stack on the desk at least two feet high of things that had to be signed. And that’s when you’re only gone one day. How a president ever leaves that desk for more than twenty-four hours, I’ll never—. I didn’t leave town more than one day at a time, with one exception; spring vacation, I finally said, “I’ve had it.” And I just left town for five days and went to Mexico. And I paid for it when I came back. It took two full days of signing to get caught up with that signing business again.

The answer to it is, of course, is to develop a scrawl, which I very rapidly did. In fact I still have it. You can’t recognize my signature. The difference between my signature when I went into that position, and now that I’ve come out several months later is considerable. I’ve been admiring my scrawl recently just thinking, “How did I get to this place?” That’s one thing you can do as far as efficiency’s concerned.

The second thing I did was to, again, place great faith—or very quickly I sorted out those things I had to be careful of when I signed and those things that were pro forma. And then there was the group that, for various reasons, it needed some pretty careful evaluation on my part. So I guess I learned to recognize those documents that I’d have to read pretty carefully (it’s just a matter of experience), and those that I could sign with complete confidence. It depends upon the document, who is forwarding it, and so on.

Oh, in the area of efficiency, I had not been too thrilled with loading secretaries up with typing of memos. I had a choice of either dictating a large number of memos— Edd Miller, I found, was a great dictator into the tape. I think he spent between six a.m. and eight a.m. most mornings, dictating. That’s

when he did it, when it was quiet, and he had a tape machine there. I used a different approach.

One of the first things I did, in fact, I ordered it the week before I arrived, because I knew it was coming. I ordered from Central Services a large supply of little buck slips. They’re about two inches by three inches. It’s a standard kind of thing—looks like this [shows sample]. It just says “memo,” and it just says “from the desk of ..” in rather small print. I got a large supply of them. And I had them printed on salmon-colored paper which was the gaudiest paper I could think of. And I gave Central Services the instructions that, no one else on campus shall have salmon-colored buck slips. Therefore, this is mine and as soon as anyone sees that color, I expect them to recognize it. And I think people did. I assume they did, because they seemed to work pretty well. As soon as they saw that color, they realized it was something I was sending.

I could just hand-write whatever I had in mind for ninety-nine percent of these things, responses to various requests, and so on. Certain kinds of things you could just write “approved” right on the request. Both Edd Miller and Armstrong used to use that technique. And that’s very good. Keep it on the same piece of paper and just write “approved,” sign it, and date it. That’s excellent for the authority to go ahead with things that are so stated. But the things that take more than just an approval, these little things did the trick.

But I found out again, office routines, and characteristics. It took me several months to find out that I was driving poor Mrs. Baldwin batty with my memo system. Mrs. Baldwin was excellent; that is, she always kept a record of everything that left the office and then as soon as the response came back, she would go into that file and then put it all

together, so I would have then, the original letter, my little response to it, and then the response to my response (if it's one of these things that goes back two or three times). She had this beautiful system set up which was all based upon my dictating things into a tape machine. Because it was very simple, just when you type up one of these off the tape, one of these memos from the president, you just make a carbon and automatically you've got the carbon system. Well, this hand-written buck slip system just didn't lend itself to that at all. And then I found out she was running that copy machine almost day and night trying to keep up; every buck slip, she would run through the copy machine. Several months later, I found out almost accidentally what she was doing. So Mrs. Baldwin and I then figured out a system wherein once a week, she would take about four or five of these salmon-colored pads, she'd insert carbon paper between every pair of pages in it, and then we put a cardboard separator in there and it was just like making a receipt book. Thus we always had an original plus a carbon of the memos and thus we saved her that running out to the machine, and she had what she wanted [laughs], and I had what I wanted. We finally worked it out near the end. Well, I think that's enough on office routines.

Description of a typical day in the president's office. Oh, I may have mentioned it, one of the things that struck me, and I found out since, has struck president Milam with a vengeance, and that is the enormous amount of *signing* that goes on in that office. I suppose you get calloused and used to it after a while. President Milam was saying that he's spending an average of two hours a day just signing documents. This is an atrocious waste of an individual's time, who has a responsibility to all facets of the University.

I took the position that rather than fight it, which for the short period I'd be in, I felt I'd just go along with it and sign it as fast as I could. I placed a great deal of faith in the signature before mine. That's the only way you can get through the day. I tried to look for—well, I developed, oh, ways of scanning a document to see if there was anything maybe a little off with it. You develop defensive mechanisms of this sort to make sure that the document looks fairly reasonable before you sign it. And documents do fall into classes, a number of which are certifications of all kinds. But it still is a monstrous problem, which President Milam is going to be tackling as he gets time to check into the legal background and he is thinking, he tells me just recently, of delegating some of this signature duties to the individuals—to an appropriate level. We'll see what'll be developed then.

So in a typical day in the president's office, an hour at least, was my level of things that had to be signed, read and signed. There was just the general quota of problems that could not be solved at any other level. There was a presidential decision called for and usually there was always one or two of those that would pop up each day. Sometimes by getting right people to talk to one another, they could solve their own problem. But I think by and large most people on campus try their darndest to get something solved before it gets to the presidential level, realizing that there is a problem if everything is unloaded up to the top. In fact, most of them were very gracious about at least coming forth with alternatives to the problem that they could see from their vantage point, and not taking the rather adamant position that "there is only one way, and that is my way," whatever the problem was. I can't give you any examples now, but again, I repeat, I was struck by the cooperation of everyone to try and work

together and only bring to the president's office for final decision, so forth, settling some knotty problem, those things that absolutely had to go there.

Meeting with people obviously comes in on a typical day. And the list is almost endless; courtesy calls from various dignitaries of all kinds, there was quite a number of those, particularly the military. Any time a military officer would be in town, the courtesy call was in line.

Another typical thing in running the president's office is the being the official spokesman either through the news media—which there were a few calls. Actually, the news media, again, was very good about not constantly asking for a quote from the president's office. They would depend upon the quotes from the principals involved in a news story to quite an extent. I did take a policy, though, that the minute a call came in from a newspaper reporter, I tried to answer it the first possible moment, 'cause I know they have their deadlines. And I'd rather at least get our point of view on record rather than just refuse to answer the phone. This seemed to work out quite well. We seemed to be treated reasonably well, all things considered, in the news media during that period.

And then, of course, there are the official functions in the typical day which go on endlessly. I believe I mentioned that way back at the beginning, trying to at least represent the president's office at all the various activities, sports events, and drama, and music, and the opening of this and that, and every time a new class opens of any sort on campus. It's a very natural thing and it's quite stimulating and it's a wonderful way to get to meet everyone on campus, but it does take time, and there you are. I don't say that it should be different; I'm just saying that is what happens. And so a fair amount of a president's

day, at least those I experienced, goes into the ceremonials and the courtesy duties.

Can't think of much else other than just—I took the position of trying to clear the desk every day of all things that had to be done or decided that day to keep business moving. I know the anxieties and difficulties of delaying a decision so that you can't get a paycheck out, or you can't accomplish a deadline for something else, so at least my typical day was to try and clear everything out every twenty-four hours, to get down to the bottom of those things that had to be done in that twenty-four [hour] period. Of course, there were some of them I slipped on. I misjudged them. I thought I had another day or two and then it would be brought to my attention the next day that there wasn't that much time.

FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS

I was worried about losing touch with the faculty, because of the time constraints and as I mentioned before, we did set up a number of meetings with any of the departments and colleges or units on campus that would want to meet. I tried to answer questions or discuss whatever I thought they would be interested in, depending on the group. This seemed to work reasonably well. I know I only hit a fraction, I'm sure, of all of the faculty, using that method, but again, this was leaving it up to them. I did not believe in holding faculty meetings for the sake of holding faculty meetings.

Of course, I maintained a very close relationship with JoDeen Flack, obviously, as chairman of the Faculty Senate. As with the relationship with student leaders, this worked out to my way of thinking, very well.

I used to meet with her every Monday morning so that we would be in touch on a consistent basis. And I used to brief her on the overall things that would be of interest to the faculty, that were going on on campus, and some of the planning that was going on. I think this worked out very well.

Mary Ellen Glass: She presented a Faculty Senate point of view and then the regents just bawled her out terribly.

Oh, yes. She felt constrained to present the Faculty Senate point of view as best she could. This she did do and this particular point of view was not all that well received by the regents. The issue was the Community College parallel courses. The problem we had with that one was that we had all advised her against carrying it too far because the further we studied it and the more data we got, the amount and the number of parallel courses, number of students involved, became fewer and fewer. Every time we studied it, we found out there were reasons why. For example, some of the parallel courses were offered in Carson City and I don't think we can argue that because we offer courses in Reno, that the Community College should not offer a similar course in Carson City. This is for the convenience of the students that live in Carson City. And so when we got down to it, the statistics that we had to support the

point of view that the Community College was damaging the University departments by putting on parallel courses just didn't support more than a very small number. My recollection was it was something like *twenty* FTE students, which is a drop in the bucket compared to departmental loadings.

Well, in any event, the Academic Council had more or less warned her, tried to head her off on this presentation to the regents, and tried to explain that she didn't have a very strong position from all the data that they could see. But she did feel that this was her duty to go ahead. Unfortunately, the Faculty Senate didn't have the benefit of all of the information that was available to her at a later date. So she did go in under a very awkward situation, trying to carry out a mandate, I think, of the Faculty Senate, based upon incomplete information.

President Miller had established that the academic vice president would chair the meetings of the Academic Council. This happened a couple of years before he left and so it was rather easy just to continue on as chairman—it was easier, I might say, easier to continue on as chairman rather than divorcing myself from the Academic Council or establishing someone temporarily as chairman. This is again part of the personnel relationship at the administrative level, and of course, the Academic Council is advisory to the president so this worked out. And for many years, both Miller and Armstrong chaired the meetings. I just maintained the chairmanship throughout.

I don't think of any notable incidents that come to mind right now of the Academic Council. We went ahead and did our usual business.

Most of the year I found the Faculty Senate and Academic Council highly supportive; particularly if you explain to them what the

problem is, you can really count on a lot of support. A university president has the alumni on one side and the regents on the other side, and not that they're taking sides, but they have different perspectives and different points of view—. And the Boosters have yet another point of view, and the news media, for sure with yet another view. It gets pretty difficult to explain to all these various publics why it is you do certain things. And furthermore, if you try and explain everything you do, they're bored to tears. There's only certain things they want explanations for. Many of the other things they don't care about.

So, I found it most helpful to have what I considered a fair amount of backing from the various groups on what I thought were the important issues of the University during that period. Obviously, there are a lot of things like, what color furniture are you going to put in an office somewhere—who cares? You can do things any number of ways, and if there's a way in which you create the fewest tensions, why, administratively that's the way to go. Because in the long run that kind of decision doesn't have too much effect upon the future of the University.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIPS

The student body president was helpful. I tried to get the student body president to at least come to an agreement. I told him exactly what I planned to do at each regents meeting. And I asked him in turn exactly what he was going to do. I don't feel it's productive in any way for the student body representative and the Faculty Senate representative and the president, which are the three units that the regents look to, to have differences in front of the regents. Fine, let's have our differences, but let's be sure we plan it. But unplanned—I should have made that distinction. Sure, I can always disagree and that disagreement can go right up to the regents; if it's that basic and we can't resolve it, it will go straight up and eventually have to be handled in front of the regents, although I would do everything in my power to at least come to an honorable settlement of whatever it was before it got to that point. But to have an unplanned disagreement, or obvious difference of views during [a] regents meeting, I think is not fair to the regents and it is not to the best interests of either student body government or the

administration. Generally, it worked. There was one time when the student body president didn't get the agenda until rather late, and I didn't find out until ten minutes before the meeting that he and I were going to disagree rather severely on one fairly important topic. I only had ten minutes to regroup. Fortunately, we came out of it all right. As luck would have it, the item happened just before lunch. And I managed during the lunch hour to get (laughs) it straight. And after lunch, then we got it settled. We got together. But well, that's a formal operation I took. And again, anything the student body president wished to ask me, within reason, I certainly wouldn't hold anything back. This is just a method of mutual trust and working together toward the common end of helping run the University, I guess, if that's the right word.

I had tried to explain to Terry Reynolds that I felt very strongly that I would tell him anything he wanted to know and I would tell him particularly and *exactly* what I intended to do, whether I was going to support him or not support him in some measure that he

wanted to bring forth to the regents. And I would tell him the reasons why ahead of time, and also, he would have one last crack at me to change my mind. We'd have this all out before we got to the regents meeting. In return, I expected the same from him. And if something happened that would change my position at the last minute, he would be the first to know and I would try not to let anything happen to change it, because I don't think that's fair, to throw him a curve the last minute.

Oh, I also got him a copy of the regents' agenda just as quickly as I could. Now, the student body president does get a regular distribution, and it was only after this incident that I then started getting him preliminary copies, which are available to a president and to the chairman of the Faculty Senate, but are not available to the student body president. And it's not that anybody is trying to cut anybody out, but there's just some kind of limit to how many preliminary things of anything you send out and how many times do we have really controversial things involving just student government. And furthermore, the student body president always gets the agenda as soon as the regents themselves do, which is usually nine days ahead of the meeting, and at worst it's seven days. So that is usually plenty of time, plenty of lead time. The preliminary agenda is available eleven days in advance.

So this particular incident was, I think the first regents meeting all by myself [laughs] and, whammy! One of the agenda items I was convinced that I had totally covered and that everybody was in agreement on, was the revised traffic code for the UNR campus. It had been gone over by our police department; by the vice president for finance, who has the responsibility for our campus security; had been gone over by the parking and traffic board, which included student representation. I'd gone over the thing rather thoroughly

with the administration because I thought if a problem's going to arise, it's going to be in faculty parking. At least to me, that's one of the most serious problems you've got on campus. As they often say, you only have two basic problems on campus; one is sex in the dorms, the other is campus parking for the faculty. So I thought, if I'm going to have problems, that's going to be it. So I'd been very careful to be sure I had all bases covered on that one. And lo and behold, when we got into it, Terry Reynolds changed his position with only ten minutes notice. Just before the regents were called into session, he said, "Oh, by the way, I'm going to take exception to five different points of the traffic code."

I asked, "What's happened?"

"Well," he said, "I just don't believe in this, this, and this, these five points."

"Well," I said, "Why didn't you tell me earlier?"

"Well, I really didn't read this till last night, and I just decided last night."

And I said, "Well, wait a minute. You've had a student representative on the parking and traffic board and you mean you're just going to just now overturn everything your student representative has agreed to and just—"

"Yep," he says, "I just can't—can't go along with I' this."

Well, that was the incident. Fortunately, there were a couple of people there, but unfortunately, Bob Manhart, chairman of the parking and traffic board was not there. I put the word out, I wanted him there as fast as possible. Secondly, I did get hold of Ed Pine and managed to take care of a couple of these concerns that Terry Reynolds had. Well, for example, not that these were earth shattering, but it was just that to get mouse-trapped was frustrating. I didn't feel that Terry was really cooperating to the extent that I would prefer he did cooperate, or to the extent that I was

willing to cooperate with him. That was my problem.

For example, one of the things I still remember was the flap about the bicycle registration. There was a section on all the bicycles on campus will be registered. Terry said, "This is just one more evidence of administration control of student lives.

And I said, "For lord's sake, let's find out where this came from."

Well, I did get hold of Bob Manhart who said, "Well, the only reason we put it in was the student representative asked us to. We don't give two figs for bicycle registration, but the student representative was hot after this one!"

So I felt really frustrated when I got into this one. So I then just said, "Forget it."

So we when we came to that item on the agenda I said, "I've just learned from our student body president that—" (because as you know, in a regents meeting, the president makes the presentation and then if there is any other input, such as Faculty Senate or student body or dean or whatever— but fortunately the president gets the first crack at it. so I was presenting this as my recommendation. "I am changing my recommendation in these three areas." The only one I can now remember offhand was this bicycle thing.

Now I don't give a darn if bicycles are registered or not. I assume that the campus was responding to a valid student *request*. What else can I think? Unfortunately, though, the regents then wanted to know, how come it's in front of us, and why are you withdrawing it?

Well, that gets a little awkward to answer in a public meeting. Because really then it starts reflecting on my capability of communicating with the student body, and darn me, I thought I'd done my half of the communicating. I'm not sure what I said now, but I think all I did was just say that, "I have had a very recent input from student government that

this recommendation is no longer desired and therefore I agree with this, and I withdraw it as being one of the points.

So that was the genesis of that particular incident. What happened was that Terry was out of town until the night before. He'd been trying to get to all of this, and he felt strongly enough about this bicycle thing that he wanted to make an issue of bicycle registration. So that's the way I handled that particular one. But I let him know afterwards— in the office, and I hope, fairly tactfully pointed out that this wasn't the best interest of student body government or the administration to do this sort of thing and that henceforth one way or the other, let's keep in little better touch with your representative on the parking board. He allowed like they didn't keep him informed. I said, "Well, I suggest you shape that up on your own. That isn't my responsibility." So, so much for that.

I found that in the couple of meetings with Tom Mayer—maybe I gained some experience with Terry Reynolds. Terry was willing to just do it on his own—he had a tendency now and then to just go it alone, regardless of the consequences or whatever.

I found Tom Mayer was much more organizationally oriented and that he understood what I was trying to do, and my relations with him were very good along these lines. That he would always come in; I'd tell him what I was going to do, he'd tell me—we didn't always agree, but that was where it was. I told him, in fact I would tell him, what I would do if certain things happened in the regents meeting. I would, I would play it out as far as I could possibly imagine with respect to student body government, and I think I made it clear to Tom that I felt strongly that the administration should support student body government as much as it possibly could, but that there were in certain areas limits that I felt I just

couldn't recommend going beyond; the legal limit for example. And that's what we got into near the end, that whole sad situation of the legal problem of how much accountability we will have in the student body funding.

That was another thing that Terry Reynolds—I started working with Terry on that one and I was willing to work hard to find a position that would minimize the fears and concerns of student body and yet keep us legal. In fact, I arranged a meeting with Cris Cufflin, myself, Terry Reynolds, and the Chancellor to come to this end, and I was under the impression that we had solved the problem, with a certain approach. And I *thought* I was hearing Terry Reynolds agreeing to all of this. And three weeks later, it all came unglued again and he wouldn't support that position.

Well, so those were the difficulties. I really didn't know for sure, exactly where I stood with Terry Reynolds on any particular subject, unless I just totally agreed with him. With Tom Mayer, conversely, I think I knew exactly where I stood and I think Tom knew where I stood. I think Tom realized I was being as supportive as I could. And I gave him the reasons, when I would disagree, as to why, and I think we understood one another. I guess I was never able to quite communicate with Terry exactly what I felt my position had to be. And it's unfortunate.

On the other hand, the parking thing was really just a tempest in a teapot. That didn't amount to anything. But that was just the symptom. The real problem came when I tried to work on this legality of accounting and that's where I guess Terry and I had a real parting of the ways. I was not about to blindly support his position on that. Because I didn't think—well, just morally and ethically I couldn't; I didn't believe I could.

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RELATIONSHIPS

Interrelations with the University of Nevada System administration, Chancellor's office, and the Board of Regents: let's start with the Board of Regents because that's the easy one. Again, I was somewhat concerned about making my presentations to the Board of Regents because I know they have a tendency every once in awhile, when you're making a presentation, to ask a question related to it that you hadn't suspected, or that you hadn't thought about. And obviously, nobody can know all the answers to everything as complicated as a university is at any point in time, but it is nice [laughs] if you got a high batting average on the number of questions you can answer. So I spent quite a bit of time getting ready for regents meetings and tried to think of all the questions they could ask, based on my experience with them. The best thing to do was to follow through on procedure that we've established for several years and that is to have someone from a particular department or college available at the meeting so that if questions of fact arise, they can answer them.

The deans, for example, do know the details of how many students are taking a certain course or whatever is going on—what the plans are in a certain department. They know it in much greater detail than a president would. And so this worked out quite well. I just introduced the subject at the regents meeting, and then pointed out that there is a department representative in the audience available to answer questions. This lets the regents see what the various administrators look like (and faculty, depending upon the subject). By and large, this approach worked, as far as I was concerned, very well. And so the answering of detailed questions didn't turn out to be the problem I thought. I thought regents meetings were going to be quite, quite trying, but by having resource personnel there, turned out to be quite straightforward, really.

There've been complaints among the faculty about the president's being treated rudely or rather roughly by the regents; I just wondered whether you'd like to comment on that.

I felt, at least it was my experience, that most of the time, I was treated very well by the regents in public and in private. In fact, I'm trying to remember—I don't think—. I think once in awhile there is one or two of the regents that, oh, like to have sport with the president, and they'll make what they feel is a humorous remark which if you see it printed somewhere or if it's related without the context, sounds—well, sounds rather rough. And this from time to time, would happen, but generally when the remarks were made, as I recall they were not at me as an individual, or not at me as the president, but related to the subject that we were discussing.

The other thing that I greatly appreciated was that I had very little pressure, in fact, the amount of pressure I got from the regents was exceedingly small. For example, I know that the regents are always being contacted by citizens over a difficulty that the citizen or their family is having with the University. The way we handle this is the regents, very carefully, when they receive this would forward it to the Chancellor. The Chancellor in turn would forward it to me. I in turn would forward it to whatever the administrator was, for investigation, and for clearing up the problem if we could. We would certainly try and do that as fast as we could. But quite often, it was a matter of explaining back to the regents that the individual wanted something that if we granted it, it would be totally unfair to all the other students. It usually is that kind of a thing. And sure, we'd like to grant everybody's request to do anything, but we do have certain standards and certain policies and rules and regulations which on the overall, is for the benefit of all, rather than just the individual. So we sent back these explanations through channels. In fact, quite often Neil Humphrey would say, "Oh, let's just go ahead and send it directly back

to the regent that had sent in the inquiries." The regents were very careful, most times, to follow that procedure rather than dumping on my head in an immediate kind of way. Once in awhile, they'd pass me a note and ask me if I'd look up something, a name or a circumstance to check into. Very rarely though, really. In fact, I had rather expected that because of the pressure put on the regents that they in turn would tend to ease the pressure by putting it over on the president, so then they could go back to the constituent and say, "Well, I have discussed it with the president." Many times, the regents would—I found out later—would argue with their constituents on behalf of what the University had done. I guess that really isn't so surprising, but I'd expected more requests, you might say. In fact, the most common request I got from regents was for an extra ticket to the football game or the basketball game, and there is nothing wrong with that because we very carefully save some extra tickets just for this very purpose. We feel that anybody that puts in as much time as the regents do on the University business without any pay, that if we can give them a ticket now and then, that's what we do.

Relationships with the Chancellor were very warm, as far as I was concerned. I established, I think I said on one of the earlier tapes, a weekly meeting with the Chancellor in which I briefed him on all items that would have impact upon the System, or that were developing on campus. I discussed thoroughly with him what I intended to do at the next regents meeting and then from him, got some advice as to possible ways of doing things. And found that after these discussions, well inevitably—I can't remember a single item in which I went forth and did not have the chancellor's backing as far as "the Chancellor also recommends this action," whatever it was. We got things well ironed out before we got

to the regents level, which I think is best for all concerned.

Well, I'll just repeat the other thing the Chancellor's office did that was most helpful in our relationships, and that was to make Mr. Jessup available in our budget building process on campus in which we had the faculty and administrators working together, as well as myself. And this was most supportive, and was most helpful. This cooperation was one of the factors that led to what I consider the most important thing we did this last year which was to get those formulas to properly reflect what our needs are on this campus for support, both in the teaching and in the operating areas.

How would you characterize some of the regents in their particular views of the University?

Each of the regents, of course, has their own personality which comes through. Each of the regents has their own way of representing their own district that they come from. And they have their own ideas on the priority of either policies or actions or resources that we have regarding the University System. Briefly, to try and characterize them, Mel Steninger, starting with Elko (way out in the corner of the state so to speak), is very interested in fiscal responsibility, is interested in the Community College, particularly as it relates to Elko, and also is very interested in the various activities of the College of Agriculture, particularly as it relates to ranching. All of which I find most understandable [chuckle] and he's the one that likes to make a humorous remark from time to time, possibly at the expense of whatever's being talked about.

Getting into the Reno area, Dr. Fred Anderson, of course, it's been his lifelong ambition to see a medical school thrive, and so you'll find he works exceedingly hard (and

effectively) with respect to matters concerning medical school. And he's also very much interested in the athletic program, being a former Rhodes scholar, this is a strong interest of his, a former athlete. Sometimes he is on the minority side, but he will stick to his guns on a minority point of view on that board. And has a considerable amount of influence. He doesn't speak too often, but when he does, they listen.

Louis Lombardi probably says the least of anybody on the board, but in talking to him privately, he's surprisingly well informed how a University functions and what's going on on the campus. He feels strongly that if you have a good athletic program, this is one of the best outreaches you have of the University into the community and the state. And he certainly has a point. This is a classical picture. And so he usually speaks up when we get into the area of the athletics. He also is the chairman, as I recall, of the investment subcommittee, so he's watching the money side of things.

The Las Vegas regent—Nedra Joyce didn't get a chance to come to too many meetings because I believe her employer just needed her during the days regents met and it was most unfortunate. She had a most difficult time arranging to be at the meetings. And therefore, she was a ready listener. She picked me up once—I'd made the statement that so-and-so was a very respected member of the faculty. She kind of smiled, didn't say anything and then during the next break she came up and she said, "Does that mean that you have some unrespected members of the faculty that you could refer to?" [Laughs] If there's a respected member, there's got to be someone that isn't. I said, oh, good heavens—I hadn't—but she did that in private.

Helen Thompson is an outspoken regent who has been trying, I think, to represent a *state* point of view, as opposed to a *district*

point of view. I think she's tried very hard. She has taken sometimes what I assume to be rather unpopular positions on the board, because they would not be supportive of, say, a recommendation from the Las Vegas campus. She would take the point of view that, for the entire system, this possibly wasn't the best thing to do and would question things like that. She would ask some very penetrating questions and once the answer was given, that would terminate that particular question.

In the case of Bill Morris, because of his athletic background, he has been most supportive of anything that has to do with the intercollegiate athletics program on the board. But he's also very interested in the building program. That was until the law school came up and then all of a sudden, why, his enthusiasm for building a law school building waned considerably—when he found out it was going to cost five million dollars. I think he was trying very hard to represent his district and represent the Las Vegas point of view more strongly than some of the other regents. Which again is, who do you represent when you're on the board? Do you represent the whole state, or yourself, or your district, or what? I guess each one of them has to make their own determination as to how they would view a particular subject.

And I sense in my own hesitation to try and characterize them, is that almost anything I try to say that would be a generalization—I can think of exceptions and therefore, I'll probably have to wind up with a summary statement on characteristics of regents. To try and characterize the regents individually as being all one way or all another way just doesn't work any better than trying to characterize anybody as being all one way or another, either being all Las Vegas, or all Community College, or all UNR, or all athletics—whatever it may be. And to prove

the point, before I came in this last year, it's one of the jobs of the academic vice president to be available and, of course, help—it's a means of communication. I've been at every regents meeting in the four years I've been academic vice president. And I tried the little game of characterizing, or trying to predict who will vote which way on all these issues. And that is a way of mentally trying to characterize each of the regents and if you can do this successfully, why, you can predict exactly how each one's going to vote; and before the meeting, you can foretell just what's going to happen. And this would be a lovely thing to do [laughs] as a president if you could swing it. Now, there are certain obvious things like apple pie and motherhood (and even motherhood is getting a little [chuckle] suspect now and then)—but there are certain things that you'll get just plain unanimous votes on, usually the transfer of funds from one nondescript fund to another nondescript fund that nobody knows too much about, but legally has to be done by the regents. Obviously, anybody can predict what those votes will be. But as soon as it had any substance, I could not predict for the life of me.

I was saving Regent Jacobsen for last. I was trying to characterize them and I have come to the conclusion that individual regents are no more susceptible to classification and characterization than is the Board of Regents as a body. I had related that I tried to predict which way the Board of Regents would vote, both individually and as a group, on various controversial issues and have failed miserably in my predictions for the last four years. And so I think the best thing to do here is to try and sum up that I think the job of being a regent is [a] particularly unrewarding one, and that is especially so during periods of stress on the campus because the regents are getting

it from their constituencies as to why they don't do something to take care of whatever the problem is on the University campus. In turn, they are being approached by faculty and by, I'm sure, some of the administration. I know my position was that I did not approach a regent other than in open meeting, unless I was approached first. This to me seemed to be the only way to go. And so with all of this conflicting advice and inputs, as I say, it's a particularly unrewarding job. There's no money in it. And what little glory there is is usually, they're always making the wrong decision according to the reports, depending upon who you talk to. And as always, if they make a right decision, why, that was only, "well, of course they'd have to do that" because it was "right," and so it wasn't due to any virtue of their own.

In general, Jacobsen, I think, proved himself to be a strong regent and as unpredictable as the rest. He sounded as if he wanted to do away with tenure and unfortunately, in his speech in which he declared that he would not run again for the regents, this was the headline that came out of it all. Later on, after he had had a chance meet with the University of Nevada, Reno tenure study committee, he said he was most impressed with the work that they were doing, with the thoroughness, and with their attitude of making sure that they got all sides of the argument in front of them, and that he was looking forward to what their final report would be. It wouldn't necessarily need to be disposing of tenure, but again he was looking forward to that. I think that it's unfortunate the press didn't pick up that kind of information as opposed to the headlines that he wished to do away with tenure.

Well, all in all, the regents, I think, do a tremendous job and sometimes surprise one with their knowledge of what goes on on

campus, which you might not suspect unless you're there. I believe I did mention that I had rather expected to get a number of calls relaying concerns of the citizens of Nevada through the regents to the administration. I found and I'm sure I said, there was very little of this. In fact, it was a rarity that that would happen. And it generally came in the form of just requesting some facts on a given situation; once they were supplied that would be the end of it. There was no further discussion by the individual regent. That sums up my remarks on the Board of Regents during that period.

HIGH POINTS, CRISES, AND TURBULENT PERIODS

We did have the big flap over the calendar. The Academic Council, and the faculty leaders and the students all got involved in that one. That was the first big administrative problem that we had. The problem was that the calendar had been undergoing some evolution and in the “good old days,” five years ago, the academic year did have a starting date after Labor Day. There was a recess during the Christmas holidays of two weeks plus a day or two and then there was possibly two to three weeks after Christmas and a final examination week. Thus, the semester ended late in January. The new semester for spring started in early February, and that’s the way it went.

There had been considerable pressure for some time to modify that calendar, and get fall semester packed in between Labor Day and Christmas holiday, the idea being that we don’t hold this threat of coming back to school and taking a final examination over the heads of the students over the Christmas vacation.

Finally as an experiment then, about three years ago, the idea of doing away with the final

exam to make possible the ending the fall semester before Christmas was tried. In place of the final exam, evaluation throughout the semester was stressed, rather than emphasis on evaluation at the end of the semester. So this was done. The reason I’m going into the history is it has a bearing as to why everything happened—why it all hit the fan at the last minute.

After the first year of operation, I did press a little bit from the academic standpoint as to what the calendar was going to be for the following year, meaning the year we’re in now, ‘74-’75. The Faculty Senate viewed the calendar and said, until we see a full cycle, we really can’t decide whether this has been a good idea or not. And so we did not see a full cycle that spring. And of course, the problem is you have to get all the catalog copy in, and you must have something in the catalog to tell people when things are going to happen—something official. And so it finally got to the point where Faculty Senate, in the spring of ‘73 said, let us have a preliminary report from the Academic Standards Committee as to how

it looks to them, and then we'll have a final report first thing in the fall.

Now you know, first thing in the fall everybody's busy and everyone is getting organized, and all of the various committees and boards are just getting appointed. There was another problem allied to this and that is President Miller was having difficulty getting student members appointed to various boards and so he was reluctant to release the official list of boards until he had the student members' names on and student government was trying to get organized. It's just a very traumatic time to do anything of a substantive nature. And so by the time President Miller left on October fifteenth, we still did not have a calendar for the following year, meaning the year we're in right now, the year '74-'75. Furthermore, we had a catalog coming up in which the copy was due in October. [Laughs] And here it was October fifteenth. But we could slip in—as long as we knew something was going to happen, you could save a blank page or a dummy page—this technique is possible. So knowing that a calendar would be forthcoming gave us another month. Thus we had something like four weeks to do something.

And it was at this point that Faculty Senate acted— Faculty Senate, when approached on the subject, said, we feel the persons best qualified to really look at this and really provide leadership in the whole catalog area is the Academic Standards Committee. Fine. This is a group of the Faculty Senate and it's a very good group. And with this the Faculty Senate more or less signed off. They just said, we now empower—as far as we're concerned, Academic Standards. Well, Grace Donehower was chairman of Academic Standards and tried valiantly to pull something together.

And what was finally pulled together was a modification of the number of periods in a

day. So that we had one-hour class periods as opposed to fifty-minute class periods. And this reduced the number of periods in a day from whatever it is—seven possibly—to six, or eight, to seven, whatever it is. And this approach caused considerable discussion by Academic Council, several members of whom, when presented with this calendar said, well, you're just kidding yourself if you think by adding ten minutes to a fifty-minute period that you add ten fiftieths or twenty percent more information transfer. Lectures just don't happen that way.

Well, this is a matter of personal preference and it's a matter of pedagogy. I guess I tend to be fairly easy-going on that because I've given seventy-five-minute lectures, and I've managed to get the amount of information transferred. It's true, you have to redo all your lectures and you have to redo all your assignments and notes, but nevertheless I got through it and I know that I can switch from fifties to the equivalent seventy-fives, so I wasn't all that distressed by this. But on the other hand, there did seem to be concern and I felt it very important that everyone at least have their inputs to this.

Well, Academic Council somewhat reluctantly, at least several of the members rather reluctantly went along with this one-hour idea. The idea was then you got more *minutes* into the period between Labor Day and the start of Christmas. That's what it was all about. Because, as you realize, the fall is very jammed up. There's the Thanksgiving holiday, and the Nevada Day, and Armistice Day, and all of these other holidays and then if you happen to have a late Labor Day, why, it becomes most difficult to get the standard fifteen weeks of instruction in. So the sixty-minute lecture was a technique for doing that.

So about the end of October, it looked as if that would be the recommendation that

I would take to the regents. The situation is that the calendar is one of those things that the regents must approve if it is substantially different from the existing pattern. And so therefore changing from fifty-minute class periods to sixty-minute class periods would require regent approval. I don't have a problem with that. I don't mind arguing for this because I feel, if everyone is supportive and students and faculty alike are willing to go the sixty-minute route, we're just going to do time. But if one group or the other is not enthused with this idea, they're going to make darn sure it doesn't work. Subconsciously, if not consciously or if not directly. It's just human nature. And so I felt it very important, even though I felt sure that no matter what we did we would have something that we could live with and hold our heads up, it still is a matter if you can get all the groups agreed before you do something that we would reduce tensions and we would have a better learning situation in the long run. So those were my motives. They may have been misunderstood. In fact, I'm sure they were: I got told by several faculty members that weren't too thrilled with the final outcome, that they weren't too thrilled with some of the things I did. I felt I had my reasons for doing what I did.

In any event, the recommendation for the sixty-minute lecture was just about ready to go to the regents when I suddenly got a ferocious assault upon the sixty-minute period by student government. And if my memory serves me right, you can look up the old Sagebrush articles. It was an unanimous vote of the student senate that, "we totally reject this idea of sixty-minute periods."

So I was now faced with an impasse between apparently all the student representatives and their leadership being passionately against the sixty-minute. Many of the faculty were upset, particularly those on Academic Standards

that had spent a lot of time wrestling with all of the ways that they could get fifteen weeks jammed into this limited period. Incidentally, the Faculty Senate before they signed off on what the calendar would look like, set forth four principles regarding the calendar limits as follows: Thou shalt not start classes before Labor Day; Thou shalt not hold classes after [Christmas]; Thou shalt have fifteen weeks in a semester, and I've forgotten the other. But it puts an impossible box around it unless you do something very unusual like some —like a sixty-minute period. And so I can understand Academic Standards saying, well, there's only one way left and that is to make longer periods; that's the only way to conform to the restraints that the Faculty Senate has put upon us and the restraint of getting fifteen weeks' worth of classes in, or the equivalent of that many minutes.

All right, so here we are, collision course. At this point, I contacted student leadership, Terry Reynolds (and Terry was most adamant about all this; fine, that's what he's there for. He's to represent student feelings), and asked him to participate in a joint meeting of student government leadership with Academic Standards and the administration (and he could bring anybody he wanted, but preferably himself and really people who knew what they were doing). And he did this. The Academic Standards Committee represented the faculty, and JoDeen Flack the Faculty Senate. There was a small group of the membership from Academic Council. I very carefully did not include the entire Academic Council because I didn't want it to [look] like I was riding shotgun with a heavy load of administrators on all this. I believe I had about four members from Academic Council there so we'd have a mix of administration, faculty, and students.

I remember we met in that big, new conference room, over in Business

Administration, late October or early November. I explained to them that, we have two diametrically opposed views regarding the sixty-minute period. And I further explained to them what was going to happen if they couldn't get together. And what was going to happen is that as president with two different recommendations, I would make my own recommendation, doing the best I could, and the chances are, regents having looked to me for running the campus, that would probably be the one that would prevail. That's just the politics of the matter. Not that my idea was going to be any better than anybody else's; it was just that if I couldn't get a consensus on any one thing, I'd have to do it. I further explained that I did not wish to do this, that I would rather have something that everyone could at least live with and support. And with that as the opener, I asked them to have at it. They made their speeches and they went through it, and they got to about the same point at the end of the first meeting. And I guess there's always that feeling that everyone has to sit tight for awhile to see what's going to happen. So that's what everybody did.

At the end of the first meeting, I said, "Well now, we haven't made much progress here other than we've all explained our positions. So I'm going to call a meeting." I've forgotten what I did now—it was within two days or some atrociously short period of time at least as far as University time scales. And just said, "Now it's going to be my intent to continue meeting like this until we get it resolved." They began to understand I was not about just to back off from this thing, that we're going to do something and let's really get serious about it.

So, Grace Donehower really was the one that pulled it around. I'm trying to remember—there were some other issues; the main issue was the sixty-minute, but there

were some other issues that I'm trying to remember that the students were very upset about. I give a great deal of credit to Grace Donehower as chairman of that committee at that point in time. She got the Academic Standards to meet around the clock and used all her influence to come up with a compromise position. We would stay with the old fifty-minute period, but we would give up the idea of starting after Labor Day. And we gave it up by about two or three days. In other words, Academic Standards and the students agreed, we'll register before Labor Day, and that's what we did this year. We registered before Labor Day and the first day of classes was the day after. Luckily, it was an early Labor Day so it was not too great a departure from the usual calendar.

So that was the compromise. The registration would occur before Labor Day, but not attending classes. Student leaders bought this, said okay, that we can go along with. And that's the way that happened. It took about another week and took a couple of more meetings before we got to that point and settled it.

It's interesting in retrospect now, after all of that tussle and struggle and trauma we went through for several weeks, Pat Beaulieu just brought up the subject of next year's calendar at the Faculty Senate meeting last Thursday and made the public announcement, "I'm saving what I consider the most controversial topic on the entire agenda till last—the calendar." And when we got to it, everybody was a pussycat and says, move to accept—bang! That was it. Took about three minutes. [Laughs] So things do change, and yesterday's trauma is quietly forgotten.

The Upward Bound problem: My involvement was to make sure that I would ask for everything in writing. I viewed this as being highly sensitive from the very moment

the accident occurred up in northern Nevada on the ice. When we got the police report, from that point on, I figured it was highly sensitive and so anything we did, we put in writing and we cleared it with the University attorney. My involvement other than that was to meet with the group at their request. There were three out of the four. The one that did not come in to meet with me was Alex Boyd. The other three, Tippy and Nadine and Charlotte, did come in to see me. I spent about forty-five minutes in an informal discussion with them reassuring them that the University was not taking the position that they *had* to do anything, but that it was my personal opinion that for the good of the program, the sooner we could get that police report squelched and squelched as hard as I could, the better off we all would be. And therefore, I told them that if I were they, I'd go ahead and take the darn polygraph and get it over with and then we'd get busy squashing it and get on with the work again. Now that's it—I boiled forty-five minutes of conversation down into a few sentences.

How about describing the problem and your reaction to the police report as it came in; what police report came to you?

The first I heard of it was that there was a report we'd had an automobile accident on the ice in northern Nevada somewhere, in January, as I recall. The car was demolished, but the occupants, our four members of Upward Bound, were safe. So we all breathed a sigh of relief and said, well, thank God somebody was watching over them, and we got through that one with only a car damaged. Next thing I knew, I got a police report directly from Ed Pine. The police—and I'm not even sure which police—it was a police report that had been sent in to Chief Malone of *our* police

department, and Malone in turn, had shown it to Brian Whalen. Brian Whalen in turn had just gone up the channel of authority to Ed Pine, and *then* Ed Pine brought it to me. At this point, we already had three people on campus that knew about it besides myself, and there would have to be a fourth person and that would be the dean who is responsible for the Upward Bound persons, which is Roberta Barnes. This is getting to be too many to keep a secret for very long. It would involve disciplinary action and so normally I'm not a secretive person, but anything that is a charge against an individual or individuals that's of a personnel nature like this was, I'm certainly going to keep confidential as long as I can. I think that's the best route of action till we can determine exactly what did happen, if necessary in court, if we have to. I was led to believe that this was some kind of an official police report that was transmitted between police chiefs. I don't know that much about police work. And so we had to bring a fifth person in on it, which is Procter Hug, the University attorney, to determine what our legal course of action would be next.

We were told by all four of the individuals, as I recall (and this is secondhand), that they had nothing to do with it. And so we all said, well fine, thank God for that. Now how do we get it cleared up?

The report was something to the effect that there was marijuana in the car?

The report claimed there was marijuana and pills as I recall—a bag of marijuana and pills stuffed behind the rear seat which was found upon a routine investigation after they left the car, and which, when I asked about it, they said this is the standard technique, that they always search the car after every occupant. And I said, well, couldn't the next occupant

have done it? No, they always search the car after every occupant, so there's no possibility there's any other way.

So then the next stage was that the individuals had volunteered to take a polygraph test and so it was all set up. And I thought well, okay, now this will get it out— finish it off— whatever happens we'll find out and that'll be that. I was then told that the four upward Bound workers did not show up. They didn't say anything, everything was waiting for them, and they didn't show up for the polygraph test.

Well then at this point, I went back to Procter Hug. I wasn't keeping a running log exactly what happened when, but in a general sequence it was at some later time that Procter Hug said that there was not sufficient evidence in his checking out of the data to bring charges.

But what we have left is a sensitive program involving young children about which people in northern Nevada are going to hear rumors unless we're able to do something to stop it. The charge was made by the police who state that we have workers for the University that are messing around with pills and marijuana and are trying to recruit young people for Upward Bound. This seemed to me a highly sensitive area and that's why I wanted if possible to get this thing cleared up. They said they're innocent) for heaven's sake, if you are, take that polygraph and then let me get a letter out to the police department up there and get it over with. That is what my motives were in this thing. I didn't know any other way to stop it and I could see the entire program being smeared with this innuendo, that the people working in it, trying to recruit young people, were not the proper kind to recruit young people, would be the conclusion you'd draw.

At some later time (and this is measured now in weeks, as I recall), and after considerable discussions, three of the four

agreed to take the polygraph. We set it up, the three of them were cleared, for which we're all forever thankful that we got over that hurdle nicely. Immediately, then, I think it was within twenty-four hours, we got a letter out explaining the polygraph clearance, which by the way included all four, because the examiner said there is no way that three could clear if the fourth one did something; the other three would know. Fine. As president, I sent out an immediate letter (checked by Procter Hug to make sure we said the right thing and said it right) to that police officer, in fact all the persons up and down the line that knew of it and said, "We have conclusively cleared it," and I've forgotten the wording now, but in effect also said, "Now, shut up!" [Laughs]

Is this the case that Harry Wolf was reprimanded for handling badly?

Yes and no. It is the same four people, but the part that Harry Wolf was reprimanded for was believing what he was told. The basic problem with the Upward Bound program was that they weren't generating a good proposal for the following year and it had nothing to do with this accident in northern Nevada. Unfortunately, the timing was a fantastic coincidence. Just at the time that Harry Wolf felt that he really had to get something tangible from them on what their planning was for the coming year, this accident occurred and the follow-up occurred. Harry had been asking Alex Boyd for the results of their planning, and Alex kept telling him over and over again, "It's being typed," and, "we're working on it," and, "we're getting the data together," and, "it's coming along beautifully, but we aren't ready yet." So Harry believed him. And this was the "lack of

supervision” that was referred to in the final hearing. Harry let it go too long, feeling that he was getting some place with Alex, when in truth he wasn’t. In fact, when HEW, San Francisco, saw the proposal that finally came out somewhere in March and April, they said it was totally unacceptable, and wasn’t good enough for them to fund. So then we got the outside investigator, John Newton, who specializes in this sort of thing, and he recommended that we just start all over again. And so that’s where it all went.

There’s a suit pending.

Yes, two of them have a suit; at least that’s the last I have record of. The other two, one was a letter of appointment for which there is no continuity, and the other had been notified during the probationary period. We tried to get Charlotte into another job. We tried to get her, with her background of counseling, to work with Rasmussen, because he needed help with the student load he has in that office. So we offered her a transfer to that office. At first, she appeared to be quite interested. Later, she said no, it was totally unacceptable. So we weren’t able to put her on for another year. We were willing to.

Affirmative action problems, circumstances of appointment of Harry Wolf. I had had presentations from a number of people through the year, primarily Mike Coray, who was the chairman of the Ethnic Studies Board, and Elmer Rusco, who was chairman of the Human Relations Board. They came in to see me some time during the spring. And both of them had told me very forcefully in a rather lengthy meeting, that their opinion, with all of the pressure for Affirmative Action, that the number one priority before the University in their opinion was to have a full-time Affirmative Action

officer. At that time, Harry Wolf was half-time Affirmative Action officer and half-time as director of Special Services (of which there were several programs, one of which was the Upward Bound program). One of the things John Newton, the HEW consultant did say was that you couldn’t expect anybody, whether it was Harry Wolf or whoever it was, to do a good job of being director of Special Services half-time. Coray and Rusco said you couldn’t expect anybody to do a real job of Affirmative Action half-time. This all, of course, comes out of the desire to try and conserve dollars because our budget for this biennium didn’t come up to what we needed; that’s why, way back on the first tape, I said, my biggest contribution of whatever I did do was to get those budget formulas around to the point where they would represent more closely our needs on this campus, as opposed to the straight twenty-to-one that we had been operating under.

So the second priority that Coray and Rusco proposed was that there be a national search for this Affirmative Action officer position. And so I said, well, fine, now are the two together? And I very carefully put that question to them. In other words, do both of these recommendations have to occur simultaneously? meaning, if I do establish a full-time Affirmative Action officer, does it mean that I have to at the same time in their opinion, institute a national search? to which Coray responded, no, the number one priority *by far* is to get a full-time Affirmative Action officer. The second priority, a national search, is just that—it *is* a lower priority.

All right, so I took that under advisement. I said, “I will do the best I can. I can’t promise anything, but I appreciate your interest in bringing it to my attention.” Coray said, and Rusco agreed, that it [was] most important that this be done in June. He felt that if it was

delayed beyond June, that this would have serious consequences in our successfully sustaining the compliance review. Well, okay, that's what I want is input, information. As we got closer to the end of the year, we developed the work program. We had by then, John Newton's recommendation that all persons currently associated with Upward Bound no longer be associated with it, so we tried to find Charlotte Morse another position. I considered then, what about Harry Wolf? Well, I asked John Newton in light of what he said, does that include Harry Wolf? And he said yes, he felt a whole fresh start was essential. All right, fair enough. And I asked him then, "In your opinion, would this experience Harry Wolf has had with the Upward Bound program detract in any way from his competence as being a good Affirmative Action officer?"

And John Newton said, "No, on the contrary, he'd make a very good Affirmative Action officer because of his experience with Upward Bound."

And so I then went to Joe Lintz who was the one who wrote the draft of the hearing committee recommendation and findings, and I asked him whether in his view, having listened to all this testimony about the charges [of] the Upward Bound group against Harry Wolf, and in light of that considerable amount of information did this mean Harry Wolf would not make a good Affirmative Action officer if he were made full-time? He said no, he couldn't see that there would be any problem there.

I then asked Roberta Barnes if she'd be willing. She would have to give up a half a position. In light of the urgency of the Affirmative Action, I asked whether she'd be willing to give up that half position which she controlled as director of Special Services, half an FTE and the salary to go with it, and have

it all go into the Affirmative Action officer which reports to the president. She said she would be willing, under the circumstances, that Affirmative Action was very important and she realized it as high priority, that she would give up any claim on that half position. I also asked her if she would recommend Harry Wolf and she said she would. So with all of that, in late June, based on all the information I could obtain and based upon the input I'd had from Coray and Rusco that this was the number one priority, and based upon my own evaluation that it was a high priority that we needed to get some more muscle into our Affirmative Action program, and half-time just wasn't really doing it, I did then appoint Harry Wolf as the fulltime Affirmative Action officer. I changed the funding from half-time in student services over into the president's office, and received approval from the regents for the transfer. The president does have the power to appoint. It does not have to be confirmed by the regents.

The appointments by the president of everyone new, any new position, or anyone in a replacement position, or any of the deans must be confirmed by the regents. But in this particular case it was not necessary, because Harry was already reporting half-time to the president, it was just an expansion of his current duties.

The energy crisis. It started in late October, but the energy crunch started to come home pretty fast in November and at that point, you may recall, there were problems of getting heating oil delivered to your house. We began to make calculations on campus as to how many days of heating oil supply did we have available? We also began to check out our contracts for natural gas as to our interruptable status. We have a favorable gas rate, or did have, because in the event of any emergency the gas company could interrupt

the University supply and send it out into the residential areas. And so we used to get a low rate because we use a large amount of natural gas, and have the capability of switching to heating oil on short notice. Something like seventy percent of all our heating is done by natural gas and another thirty percent by fuel oil of one kind or another on campus. And furthermore, realizing the fuel shortage was serious, we felt that we'd better do some contingency planning. We did all the usual things, such as encourage everyone to cut their thermostats down, put everything on automatic that we could, closed buildings down sooner. I had the custodial staff come in at four o'clock, instead of five o'clock. We consolidated all the classes in the evening into just two or three buildings, instead of keeping all the buildings open, and started the plan of cutting out every other light in the hallways to reduce the electrical loadings, reduced the amount of ventilation in buildings (we were overventilating many buildings) down to minimum levels, as opposed to maximum levels. We deliberately closed the buildings down to something like fifty to fifty-five degrees on the weekend instead of just sixty-five. Before the shortage, there were some buildings we did not close down because the labor cost more than the fuel saved. These conservation measures took a lot of B & G manpower. But we did them all. The campus population, I think, responded beautifully. I had very few serious complaints. In fact, we did it on a feedback basis. In other words, make a large change in a building operation instead of numerous small steps. We would take a step that we thought would bring a building to some level that's acceptable to all concerned, and if we're wrong, we'll depend upon everyone getting on their hind legs and saying, "Wait a minute! It's far too cold here" — or "too hot," or whatever the problem is.

The answer sometimes comes out different in different cases. For example, there's a heat line that covers the old part of campus, including the physical plant building, the police department, anthropology, Mines building. There's a whole string of buildings over in that area that's on one heat line and when you cut down the front end of it, the last office started to get starved and the temperatures were running about fifty degrees in the last office. When we found out the consequences of doing this and what it was, instead of turning the entire pipe line back up again, which means an enormous amount of energy consumption, we decided the answer was just to provide an electric heater in that last office. And this makes more sense than burning up beaucoup energy.

Another example was Palmer Engineering. That whole building is strictly off-on. You either turn it on or off; there's no in-between. And you can't zone it in any way, at least not quickly. Of course, our problem was to do something within a week or two and try to get as much of the campus closed down during Christmas vacation which is a heavy heating season—the last two weeks in December and the first week or two in January. The more we could save then, would get us through the year. Thus in Palmer, what we did was, we put an electric heater in the secretary's office because all the classrooms during that period and most of the professors' offices were not being used. But we did have to maintain continuity by having the secretary there. In some cases we even managed to move the secretaries out into another building, and—but that gets us into troubles of trying to reswitch telephone lines over for temporary periods. You have the trade-off as to, how much can you invest in money and time and effort to just cut down on the heating bill for three weeks for energy consumption. Of course, the two are

tied together as we all know. The upshot of the whole thing was that we did manage to cut our overall consumption almost thirty percent, compared to the preceding year, and this is heating more buildings than we were the preceding year. So I think it's a rather notable achievement.

We did so with very little complaint. Usually, as I say once we got a complaint, we could go do something about it. But there were a couple of real bad ones that occurred. Most unfortunate. The other thing was that it was estimated that if we had not gone into the energy conservation, because of the increases in natural gas prices and in fuel oil cost, that if we had just let it go the way it was and not taken any of these steps, we would have to have paid \$200,000 more for energy and we didn't have any \$200,000, I'll tell you. But when I had to scrape as hard as I did just to get another half position for Affirmative Action, much as I wanted that, \$200,000 just wasn't in the cards. So we saved our bacon that way. And it's going to be worse this year, because the rates have gone up since. But we have some things in mind.

Two more things, before I get off onto the mishaps that happened during that period: one was that I made the number one priority for any year-end money that we could accumulate—usually there's a little bit here and a little bit there and you put it all together, and you can put together a little bundle at the end of the year; quite often we put it in library books. This particular year, I said our first priority is going to be to buy automatic energy conservation equipment. Automatic thermostats, automatic valves, time clocks, and whatever it takes, so we can shut down, because they'll pay for themselves in no time and we'll save money year after year, instead of just having it run down the drain.

The other thing I did was to establish an ad hoc energy committee. They worked as individuals rather quietly. I asked them to help generate pronouncements to come from the president's office on whatever needed to be said about energy conservation. I had envisioned kind of a monthly letter from the president on where we stand with energy. Somehow we managed to get through without doing that. They did a lot of work though, in trying to help track down individual difficult cases and to see what they could do to make solutions for them, or come up with some way to fix it so that the lack of energy would be acceptable.

There were two places we missed. On a Friday night, one of the valves over in the Life Sciences wing [of Agriculture] stuck or broke and it did this in the "closed" position. It wasn't discovered until Sunday morning, I believe, so there was a day and a half, maybe going on two days. Sometime Sunday they discovered it. By that time the temperature dropped in Life Sciences, down to something like fifty-two degrees. It was not planned that way, it was just a most horrible accident. A lot of this old equipment on this campus was getting a workout like it'd never seen, trying to conserve energy and make it do what we wanted it to do. Well, it broke. As a result, we came close to wiping out one colony of biological specimens over there. I think we did actually have direct damage on another experiment involving biological experiments. We were worried that all the tropical snakes would be dead. But they survived. We immediately, of course, air-lifted a new valve in, put in temporary measures, and got through that period. And then we tried to get the animals moved out of the Life Sciences wing, because that was the only room, or the only area of a rather substantial building that

took a lot of energy. But it turned out to be impossible from a practical point of view to move it to any other building. And so at point then, we tried to fix up one room with local control and with some extra weather stripping and extra insulation over the window areas—we put plastic insulation over the windows to cut down heat losses—and that seemed to work reasonably well. One of the things we're doing now with the contract to "refrigerate the Ag/Life Sciences" [is to include] night set-back thermostats. In addition, if you put in one central system instead of all those small window units (they're highly inefficient; they really don't do the job right and they burn up a lot of electricity), we'll save money on the electricity and maintenance of all those small window units. The automatic night set-back thermostats can be set back at different levels. In other words, it's a way of zoning that building, which gives us control of the building, which therefore this winter ought to give us considerable savings on energy consumption without endangering any of their projects.

The biggest flap we had really though was that Chemistry Building. That building was the most atrociously designed building from the standpoint of energy consumption I've ever seen. It was terrible. It *is* terrible. The entire building has to be heated and ventilated just to run a single hood, and that is a big building. And at one point someone calculated, it is forty bucks an hour just to heat the outside air to keep it going, during zero weather outside. And that's with nobody in it; that's just to keep the airflow going through the building of all those hoods. Because it is chemistry, there are safety regulations that you have to keep the building ventilated at a certain minimal level. There is the further complication that several professors

have twenty-four-hour, seven-day-week experiments that they're running, which, if you don't keep the temperature just so, gets to be a problem for them.

We eventually established kind of a truce between our needs to conserve energy and their needs to do their research. And we have a mutually agreed upon schedule in which we only keep it open two thirds of the week, one third of the week it is shut down, but two thirds is still one heck of a lot of energy. Just as fast as we can, we're trying to get switched over to some hoods on separate units, so that we can have individual rooms running twenty-four hours a day for their purposes instead of the whole building.

The number one priority for capital improvements money in the next biennium budget will be energy conservation changes on campus, such as zoning various buildings, such as putting all separate hoods into that Chemistry Building so that we can control it.

Some of the good things about the energy problem. I got reports back from the students that finally, a number of buildings on campus were comfortable instead of being overheated and putting them to sleep in class. They were down to a comfortable level for teaching purposes. I think public buildings tend to be hot anyway, at least that's been my experience. So we did gain a little there.

In general, that's the energy story, and we're going to continue to try to reduce waste. What we picked first, of course, were the biggest energy consumers. This year, we'll be working on items that will pay off at lower levels of savings, but still we'll continue on that.

The streaking situation ...

I take the view the "indecent exposure" laws are to protect our society against the

sick and warped mind, characterized by the warped mentality of someone that feels that they must expose themselves publicly. And I'm terming this in a sexually warped, perverted way. I don't believe that the exposure we're talking about in streaking has anything at all to do with that. I look upon streaking as just plain hijinks and youthful spirits and the desire to shock the elders. Well, fine. I took that point of view in my dealings with the press and with my dealings with the public, and the regents, and nobody gave me an argument. In fact most people just agreed and that was fine. And as a result, why, why make an issue of it? I thought it was rather humorous, particularly the one they did when they were having a seminar on obscenity. I thought that was most apropos. They couldn't have done their streaking at a better spot.

Well, I was lucky, in terms of controversy, flaps, and crises. In general, I was blessed with a very quiet year, all things considered. And it seems to be continuing on this year in much the same tone. I think there's a different atmosphere on campus. I don't think [laughs] I could have made it through the year if it hadn't been a quiet year!

You mentioned budget preparation before and I think you've gone into that pretty thoroughly.

I did that one thoroughly. And the \$100,000 windfall —we took care of that one. In fact, that first \$100,000— there were two of those, actually. The first one, the 107 Committee got involved and it turns out (and as long as we're not going to release this right away) —but it turns out that they actually were recommending a little more for B & C than I had in mind, [laughs] which is just as well, because we really needed it in B & C when the end of the year came. But our thinking was surprisingly alike with the

first \$100,000 and that is, get it back to the operating accounts where we'd taken it from the beginning. Because part of that hundred thousand, you see, was the eighty-odd thousand from the land grant, the Morrill Act money, that became available. That's why we had it and so it should go back into the very thing that we took the money to make up for that loss the preceding year.

The second hundred thousand was—much of it, we had to make a case for one-shot. We were exceeding our spending authority, and that was in the spring. So we put \$10,000 over into research initiation, as a one-shot go, one shot in the arm to help that out. We also put \$5,000 in the postage account, which was needed because of the postage increases. It has to come from somewhere. And then one of the larger items—and I don't remember specifically now—was to go ahead and finish up the complete "refrigeration or air conditioning" of the Ag and Life Sciences, which would give us control of our energy consumption over there. Capital improvements are the kind of thing for which we can get additional spending authority. If we just burn it up in operating costs, chances of getting spending authority are very slim, in fact almost nonexistent. So that worked out.

Student housing. We spent lots of time on it going over, and over, and over again, alternate uses for those dormitories and how are we ever going to get out of this problem? And finally, we came to a conclusion that, at almost all costs, keep the dorm rates from going up any more. And I think that's part of what's paying off now. We're up to ninety-five [percent] occupancy now. And that's with Juniper open. And part of it is that the dorms are becoming a better deal than the off-campus housing. It's just a financial situation. Also, by getting the new food service in, we held the food cost down. We were able to hold

them even. That was another problem—the court case— regarding the food service employees. But that one worked out, and now we have a contract food service.

The thing really that saved student housing was the judges and the military occupying it at almost a hundred percent occupancy all summer long, in which we picked up enough on those dorms to get us through the deficit of the year. Now with ninety-five percent occupancy, I think we're in wonderful shape over there, better than we've been for years.

Student health services—we're still trying to come up with something on that. There are a number of different ideas as to how to deliver this health service.

My problem was the student health service committee that was already on campus, which had membership of students and administration and the health center, seemed to have the idea that what we have was pretty good and the campus could use some more. On the other hand, the student government as represented by Terry Reynolds, seemed to feel that because now we're going into Union expansion and the possible relocation and rebuilding of the student health center, particularly the MacMillan money was involved here, that there was the opportunity to rethink and decide how much health care our students really did need. He was not particularly enthralled with the policy views of the Health Science Committee. Therefore, he asked for a special committee, ad hoc presidential committee, which seemed to me—all right, let's have at it. Let's see what kind of fresh point of view we'll bring out. I could use all the help I could get. So I got recommendations from Dean Barnes, who is the responsible administrator for the health services as to the membership on this committee, and from Terry Reynolds, and we put it all together, both sides agreed,

fine. Thus a four-person ad hoc committee was established. They worked very intensively for about a month or six weeks, gave me the report, and by the time they gave me the report it was about June. And we were getting awfully close to president Milan coming in, and I felt with a major decision of this nature, I could not see the urgency in having to make a decision in June without considerable input from him. So we sent him a copy of the report and he is working on it right now.

This was a very excellent committee, John Altrocchi, Brad Stone was the student who's a vet and very good, Len Pearson, and the chairman was Margaret Rockenbeck of Student Services. They're still working on it. In fact, the president's still asking some more questions which we're getting answers to, as to the best way to resolve the amount and level of health service delivery on campus.

Writing and adopting the new UNR Bylaws. Faculty Senate worked and worked and worked on this. They really got serious about it as the year came to an end and during the summer, finally put it all together. I had very little input to this. Well, it seemed to me the best thing to do was for Faculty Senate to get together and to put together the best set of bylaws they could, and then let's look at them from an administrative point of view and find out if there're going to be pitfalls or difficulties. That's the exercise we're going through right now. Academic Council is meeting in extra sessions and going over certain of the bylaws that we feel might be administratively difficult, and finding in some cases, it's a matter of a little rewording. The intent is all right, it's how it was worded that is causing problems. And we do have Pat Beaulieu and Ed Barmettler. They are meeting with us and we are finding much area of agreement, really, once we decide what the intent is—we all work together. There will be

some areas of disagreement and at that point there will be a joint committee of Academic Council and Faculty Senate as we view it now, which we'll try and see how much they can resolve.

Press relations. I've already talked to you about that one. I thought it was interesting at one point. Every once in awhile, someone would come in and say, "Our press relations are lousy because we don't get in the newspaper very often." And my reaction is, well, I think that denotes excellent press relations because usually the reason you get in the newspaper is because you fouled up somewhere. And so half of what we do on press relations is to keep undesirable news, or untruthful news, or gossip, out of the newspaper. Whatever it is that we're doing, we'll stand up and be counted, and whatever we do, maybe we're wrong, but let's at least get the facts straight. So half our time is getting the facts straight and occasionally, when you get them straight they don't want to print the story any more. It just isn't news. It's pretty blah, dull. The other half, of course, is to try and get our accomplishments printed. You're right. We'd love to get more of them printed. I think if you really look, there's a fantastic amount of accomplishments that are printed in the news. It's just that when it's mixed in with all of the other news, the percentage in a day's paper looks pretty small. Looking over the press clippings—the president gets all the press clippings from the state and every week I read through—and they form about an inch thick, a stack of reproductions of clippings. That's not bad. Could do better.

In general, I tried to be as open as I could. Once in a great while, I'd brief them (and this is once maybe every two or three months). Very rarely would I ask them to hold something; I would tell them whatever it was they wanted to know and I'd ask them

please hold until something happens because otherwise, "we want to tell the individuals directly, and not set up a 'read it in the paper' kind of situation."

How well did you work with Ed Olsen on this kind of thing?

I usually saw Ed Olsen once every day or two. I kept very close to him. I made a regular round. That's part of the daily activities. I'd try to check with him, oh, maybe every day at certain periods and every two or three days at other periods, just to keep in touch and make sure that I was well informed. And if he knew of anything that was brewing, he in turn would make it his business as soon as he heard anything, to let me know. Well, it worked out, I thought, very well. I did make a practice of letting him know a lot of things that were going on on campus, so if he picked it up, he'd know how to respond. He has to know what's going on. So I spent a fair amount of time briefing him on a number of things that would be coming up, so he'd have at least an approach to it and know who to contact in case the reporters started calling him.

Women's athletics. That was, to my mind, one of the big successes of the year, women's athletics. I really was pleased because it had all of the earmarks of being one of these head-on confrontations between the jocks and the rest of the world, over the fact that there are certain non-athletically-oriented faculty on campus that feel athletics takes away from the academic side of the university community, in terms of resources. There are those that are strongly in favor of athletics. There are the Boosters downtown. There is the whole question of women's athletics and we just had this big report of the Faculty Senate, in which Edd Miller accepted the report, and established the ground rules that there

would be two boards. But then he left it to me to name the two boards. The reason he did was because we couldn't get the student membership. Time and again the problem has been this darn problem, by the time everyone gets geared up, it's Christmastime. And you try and get these boards and all these other activities going, and by the time they meet and then make some decisions and do a little reviewing and get caught up with what the problem's all about, why, a couple of months have gone by.

In any event, I was given the framework, which I thought was quite good. We'll have a women's board and a men's board. They'll be separate, but they'll be together at least once a year and discuss whether they should form a single board at some time. But let's not tackle too many problems all at once. And let's give the women's athletics some autonomy so they won't get steamrollered, I think is part of what he had in mind, which I think is very good. Well, at least that potential would always be there if you don't watch out. By having a separate board—it is cumbersome because both directors and both boards report directly to the president. Which means an awful lot of reporting at the presidential level, but again, I didn't mind because in fact it worked out not to be such an onerous duty at all. They didn't ask for that many appointments. They tend to solve their own problems. They would bring them in in a little bundle and I'd meet with them, oh, I don't know, once every month or two. That worked out quite well.

As we developed, because we did have a little extra spending authority, a little contingency reserve developed during the year, we were able to respond to some of the difficulties of the women's intercollegiate athletics in trying to get caught up and get on the same footing as, at least in some of the areas, on a more or less equivalent footing

with men's intercollegiate athletics. So I felt we were able to respond rather well and we had everybody working toward this end. Ed Pine constantly had his eye open for various little sums of money that could be diverted over to help out women's athletics and he'd suggest it once in a while. And then Henry Hattori, he'd suggest something once in a while. All in all, it was quite a pulling together. The women's board, I thought acted with considerable restraint, considering the probable desire to get very militant about the whole thing. Now after fifty years of neglect, we want to get caught up right now. Very understandable. But I think they realize that in the long run, we'll all make a lot more mileage if we work together. And let's do it as quickly as we can. And I think everyone was committed to that.

So I'll tell you this. Any time Lu Lilly [Director of Women's Athletics] came in with a suggestion, and I knew she was in touch with her board all the time, I would strip a gear to try and come up with something. Maybe I didn't bring in the whole banana, but I sure worked at it. I think in general, we managed to right a number of the inequities that had been existing.

When it came to the women's intercollegiate budget, again, I thought they were quite restrained. They didn't just try and produce a carbon copy of the men's budget with just the word "menu s" changed to "women's" at the top. They came up with their own budget, with their own kind of staffing, and with their own needs, not just—as I say—not trying to come up with the same number of dollars the men had. It turned out to be somewhat less, as I recall. But in any event it was their budget and I looked at that thing and I thought, well by golly, I can't find anything wrong with this. So I forwarded it with this campus's recommendation, and pointed out that, in my opinion, it was a very restrained

budget. There will be the temptation coming with three times as much as you thought you'd ever get. You know, the budget approach. They didn't use that approach. I think they used a very sensible one. So I didn't even touch it, I just forwarded it without pruning a bit. Sent it out and the Chancellor's office accepted it in the same light, and the regents did. So it just went bang, bang, bang, and was approved at all levels. That budget probably was the cause of the least problems of any budget at all levels. I think that's proof then of the wisdom of how they approached it and what they sent forward. I asked them to send forward the best budget they could that would still be practical. Not a gold-plated budget, but a good solid budget that we could really stand by. And they did.

The press kept asking me, "When are you going to name the members of the boards?"

I just explained it to them. I said, "Look, just cool it. Wait until I get these student representatives named, and we'll do it." And they were very good. They could have let me have it in the sports pages. And even when it came out, they did a fairly factual treatment. They didn't try and stir up the "men versus the women" arguments in the sports page. So, all in all, it went, I thought, very well.

Writing and submission of four-year plan? This was just a legislative requirement that has to be done. We put more emphasis on it this year than we did the year before; it must be done in time for each biennium request. It gives the legislature some idea where we're going. The Chancellor's office provided the leadership here. And in fact, they paid John Malone part of his salary and they hired him part-time to help prove the leadership for these plans. And we worked on it all year. It's a cyclical process in which everybody writes up something, and then you try and edit it, and then you try and fit it into a format, and

then you send back to everybody so they can see what everybody else wrote, and then they change theirs to get it to fit in. And you go through the whole process again and eventually, if you get enough cycles on it (and the next cycle is in about two weeks—the last one I trust), it'll be coming back from the Chancellor's office in all its glory, and then we'll see what the whole thing looks like and everybody can have one last crack at it as far as their own area is concerned. Well, it's just a job that we did during this year and for once, we did it at a System level rather than five divisions all going five different directions. At least, we provided the basic information from our own campus and worked that out, but now it's being fitted together as a package rather than just as five individual sections of writing. We involved on this campus, our own departments and colleges to a very large degree. That's part of the whole idea; is to get people involved and thinking about it.

The UNR centennial celebration. I think this'll be my third or fourth centennial celebration. As I've moved west, the centennials keep moving west with me. My first one was in 1955, and I was really involved in that one back at Michigan State University when they had their centennial. So anyway, I was not involved in this; this was a presidential activity worked out with Dean Basta. By the time Edd Miller left, I had gotten to the point where the committees were all making their reports on the kind of things they wanted to do. There were a lot of activities listed. I tried to involve Sam Basta with the Academic Council. He had large sheets of calendars of possible events, and lists of things to be done. He worked with departments and colleges, alumni, and all kinds of committees. He put this whole mass of materials together. The Academic Council, somewhere in January, was concerned, where are we going with all

this? What's going to happen? So I scheduled Sam to come in, and after he'd given his pitch, they still wanted to know, what's going to happen? I said, "We're now at the phase where we've done all our brainstorming so let's get with it and start to price all of these things out and once we've priced them out, then we put priorities on them, and then we see how the resources we might have available will match up with what it is we want to do.

Well, in general, I tried in a very tight budget year to provide out of the president's operating [budget], a sufficient amount of money to keep things going and make commitments that had to be made last year, so that they would become true this year. There's just certain things you have to order way in advance, or schedule, or supply the down payment, or whatever it is, or authorize. So I did that. And so the president's operating took a bit of a beating. That's where some of the money for the centennial was obtained. There was a gift of \$5,000 that arrived just the month that Edd Miller was leaving. He suggested that this be made available as seed money for the centennial, to be used to get matching monies from the Council on the Arts. I agreed with him wholeheartedly; you've got to have something to start with, a little bait. So that five thousand *was* used as bait and we did get some matching money.

We finally got down near the end. By the end, I mean it got to the point where we really had to decide sometime around April or May, exactly what it is that we're going to do and how much it's going to cost. So at that point, they finally got the priorities ironed out and they got the prices. And the prices were adding up to something like \$100,000. A hundred thousand dollars is not the kind of money that we had available. So we wrote a proposal to Fleischmann. And that was to go into the regents meeting of May, I guess

it was. Well, all right, you have two shots a year at Fleischmann; once in November or December, and once in May or June. That's it. The regents control all proposals to Fleischmann. I had two requests from this campus; one for about—and I think that one at that time, was maybe fifty or sixty thousand. It wasn't up to the hundred thousand mark. That came later. But fifty or sixty was what the centennial committee was asking from Fleischmann. And the other was for \$375,000 from Fleischmann for getting an addition on the medical building. Our anatomy lab is an absolute mess in more or less a condemned building, and I'm trying to get rid of that thing. So what happened was, we had these two from this campus so I forwarded them. And when we had a meeting of the cabinet, it turned out that those were the only two from the System. And Neil Humphrey said, "You know," he said, "if I were you, I'd think strongly about forwarding only one, because if you only forward one, you've got a *damn* good chance of getting it."

Everybody else backed off. "Ah," they said, "you got a big one that you want, this \$375,000, we'll hold off until December."

So everybody else backed off, Las Vegas and Community college, DRI. It was my decision that for the greater good of the campus, that I try and find money somewhere else for the centennial, and I put all my bets on one large request to Fleischmann. And we got it. They came up with the \$375,000. In fact, the federal government has also come up with \$900,000. We got about ten percent of all the new construction money in the country for med schools from the federal government. We're looking for the last \$375,000 now. This all has to be matched to make it all work.

So that put it off then until the June meeting as to, what are we going to do about the financing for the centennial?

Well, meanwhile, I had come up with some other kinds of money here and there, and made some commitments but the total was still falling very short. All the things I put together that I could get my hands on at that point in time (and I didn't feel that I could be taking money from operating accounts or anything like that on campus; it had to be something that would not diminish an ongoing program). Tom Mayer got very interested in it and was pushing very hard to get money from Regents Special Projects [fund]. So I agreed to that. But Tom wanted a separate request to enrich student activities during the centennial year. So the whole thing was adding up to this hundred thousand.

At that time then, it was some time in June, President Milam came on campus for his initial visit to get acquainted. so I reviewed it all with him. In fact, I spent more time with President Milam on this problem of financing the centennial than any other item. Sam Basta spent an hour reviewing the entire centennial with him. It was his recommendation, which I concurred with (in fact, it was along the lines of what I was thinking, too, so we agreed on this), that probably the level of funding that would make sense would be approximately \$35,000, of which we already had about ten in hand and we needed another twenty-five from Regents Special Projects and that would be about the reasonable limit. It was with this in hand then that I went forward and made the recommendation to the regents. They voted for the twenty-five thousand, of which about nineteen thousand was in [the] student enrichment project. Enrich the yearbook, the dramatic events they have, like "Spirit of '76," this sort of thing. Various cultural events the students are interested in, put extra monies into that during the centennial year, make them extra special.

And that's where it stood. They did do that, and so the centennial is going forth at about that level. Sure, it would have been nice to have the hundred thousand, but I just for the life of me, couldn't see going much beyond this level of funding.

Well, my personal involvement was, where do you get the money? I have encouraged everybody to use this as a showcase for our own people, not to just spend a lot of money bringing in famous people from around the world to give us lectures, but let's use the centennial as the activity where we show off what we are doing. And therefore, with considerably less expense, use it as a showcase. so that was my philosophy on the whole thing.

As far as notable events of the centennial celebration it's all—it's about to happen now, so that's after the fact. Let's hope it all goes off well. I'm looking forward to it.

The Presidential Search. We can dispose of that fairly quickly, because my involvement in that was minimal. I met with each of the candidates, anywhere from twenty to thirty minutes. They were all very different. I was surprised at the variety of philosophy and personality. In twenty or thirty minutes, I don't believe you could come up with a real evaluation. I did not have any of the vitae, so in twenty or thirty minutes I found out what I could about them. I had some reactions of course, but as far as making any assessment of the individuals based on that short a meeting, I certainly didn't.

Assessment of the process? Heavens, the committee went through a national search and that was it. I don't know anything else to say there.

Prediction for President Milam's term. I think, fairly cautiously, it looks pretty good. Well, not knowing the man too well—you never get to know them until you really have to work with them for awhile, but I am very

impressed with his commitment to do the thing that he feels is absolutely best. He is not one to compromise. He will spend a lot of time working on a decision, but he works hard on getting reasons for the decision. It isn't just a whim, or, "I think this is the way it ought to be." He really works at it. It's going to take a little while for people to get used to him, I think. He has a tendency to ask rather penetrating questions fairly early on in association with individuals, as I've noticed, and so I think people tend to put their guard up a little bit, the first few times they meet him, and it's going to take awhile for me to get used to him. But I'm very well impressed with what I've seen so far. And so my prediction is going to be that he will grow on us, and will do a very good job.

He's particularly good at what you'd expect. At least, I feel he's good at a number of things in the area of political science and the subject of representation, things of that nature. For example, he's looked at the representation of the Faculty Senate and has asked some questions about that, which just wouldn't occur to me. We have a vote and somebody gets in and that's it. He goes deeper than that. And he's done the same thing with the Staff Employees Council, looked at their representation. The very fact that he even looked at it is indicative of his interest. I'm afraid that I would have just, again assumed, you vote, and then we go ahead and start having meetings. He looks deeper than that into the whole question of representation.

He is *very* knowledgeable on the financial end of things. It's a delight just to sit there and listen when he asks Henry Hattori questions about how the financial mechanics works and because of my experience in that office, I can understand what he's asking and I can follow it pretty well. It's rather interesting to hear the two of them.

The other thing he does is something that I have done over a long period of time and that is, particularly when you're new on a job, don't assume that just because we've been doing something this way for years that it's an ironclad law. All too often, he has found, as I have found independently, that quite often, just questioning, "Why do we do things this way?" or, "Why is that rule written that way?" quite often, you'll find that it's either just, "Oh, somebody did it a long time ago and it seemed to work and we've been doing it that way ever since," or there was a very strong personality that was writing the rules that day and nobody ever questioned the rule. So it just got printed and once it got printed it's the very devil to get it unstuck.

We both have been having a good deal of fun recently looking at some of these rules and asking that question and I find it quite refreshing. I've been here eleven years and I tend to accept some of these things we do as being gospel. Unfortunately, that is the fault of being in any one place too long. And you do start to do that. So the spirit of inquiry now has taken over at the administrative level and we're finding out all kinds of surprising things that we thought were regents rules or legislative rules; they turn out to be sometimes just plain old ground rules that can be changed without too much effort.

What other prediction would you want me to make? I think that's just about where it is. He's a very difficult man to brief because I try to brief him on something I'm all ready to brief him on and then he'll want to ask questions on another topic. He asks a lot of questions I frankly don't know the answer to, then I have to go back to the drawing board and start digging the answers out. But we're going through this phase right now.

CONCLUSIONS

It's a very lonely spot to be in because there's nowhere to turn to. When a problem finally gets up to the president's level, you have to make a decision. The problems that do reach that level are usually the tough ones and decisions just aren't easy. You have to make a recommendation and it has to be the best you can come up with. You've got to think it through, and marshal the arguments, and do the best you can in making a recommendation to make to the regents on behalf of the University. It's a very demanding job. Sometimes I wonder why anyone in their right mind would want that job. I got to wondering that once in awhile, but then the stream of events picks you up and carries you along and you have some real good days, and every once in awhile you can look around and say, gee, there was a decision I made that worked out well, and so you can take pride in the fact that you did it. And then there are the other days when you think, golly, it must have been wonderful to be a president back in the 1940s and '50s when all the president had to do was to say, "This shall be done," and

all the students and faculty would genuflect and [laughs]—oh, wow, that must have been something! But on the other hand, I'm sure they had other problems then that took their toll.

I don't know. It's exciting, obviously, stimulating, but well, I guess I've said it many times throughout the interview here, I guess the one thread that runs through almost all of the relationships I had (and I don't mean just with students or just with faculty, but I mean everybody) was the desire to be cooperative. Yes, there's got to be a few exceptions. I know of one lady that's been trying to get her daughter's grade changed for three years. I never could make her understand why as president, I just didn't wave my magic wand and change a grade. I couldn't communicate with her. In the vast majority of cases, most people, even when you rule against them, or at least the ruling looked as if it was ruling against them, I tried very hard to explain why as soon as I could, whatever the situation was. I found, almost without exception, that people realized that that's part of the job, and

accepted the decision, whatever it was, and were supportive and helpful.

I really can't think of too much to add. I do know there's one thing that did save me and that was during the past three years, during the period when we were having the crises on campus, I learned to leave my problems at the office. For example, the first crisis I remember is what I refer to as the "Tuesday night meetings." This was when President Miller was having trouble with some of the black athletes on campus. They brought in a man as a speaker and he took on the entire white race; no matter what you did, you were wrong. And so we had some rather noisy meetings. They were held over at the Union and we got the help of John Dodson from the Center, and tried to provide a mechanism, a meeting to let everyone air their points of view. One was held up in the Travis Union lounge, another one was down in the dining room because there wasn't room upstairs. I used to worry about things like that. In fact, stay awake nights worrying about it. Goodness, what can we do about all this? Well, what'll we do? What's going to happen? I had several years of that kind of activity, the BSU sit-in, for example, because I was academic vice president I got involved in that one, and the bomb threats of which we had quite a few. And there was the decision of what to do with a bomb threat. In any event, I learned during that period to, when I left the office, not to take the problems home with me. And so I learned just to go to sleep. Fortunately during the nine months I was plagued with a lot of problems, why, I could go home at night, get a good night's sleep, and the next morning, they didn't look nearly as bad.

Well, my future plans are—I find the job I've got now exciting enough and demanding enough to suit me. I love Nevada and I love this University, and everything about it. Oh,

well, I get upset once in awhile at some aspect of it, but in general, I don't know of any place I'd rather be, so I'm going to be here. And I'm going to be in this job as long as President Milam feels that I can perform the way he wants it performed. I'm going to do the best I can. I don't have any aspirations to be a college president, come what may. That is, that's not my real life's aim. I've always looked for an interesting job and got promoted almost by accident in most situations. So my future is working together with the team we have here and doing whatever I can to forward the interests of the University. It's as simple as that. And I believe we've come to the end.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

Academic Council, 14, 17-19, 48, 49, 71, 74, 77, 110
Academic Standards Committee, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78-79
Academic vice president, 5, 20, 23, 25, 29, 30-31, 33-35, 49, 68, 121
Affirmative action, 86-89, 93
Agriculture, College of, 65, 94-95, 99
Altrocchi, John, 101
Alumni, 20, 26, 49
Anderson, Elizabeth, 23-24, 27
Anderson, Fred, 65
Anderson Health Science Building, 27, 65, 112
Armstrong, Charles, 14, 41, 49
Articulation board, UNS, 15
ASUN president, 51-59
Athletics, 65, 67, 105

B

Baldwin, Jean, 32, 33, 41-42
Barnes, Roberta, 81, 88-89, 101
Basta, Samuel M., 110, 113
Beaulieu, Patrick L., 79-80
Bicycle registration, 55-56
Black athletes, 120-121
Black Students Union, 16, 121

Boyd, Alex, 80, 85
Breese, Charles R., 3, 5
Buildings and grounds, 8, 36-37, 90-91, 98
Bylaws, UNR, 102

C

Calendar, University, 71-80
Centennial celebration, 109-114
Chancellor [UNS], 20-21, 32-33, 58, 60, 62, 63-64, 107, 108, 109, 112
Chemistry building, UNR, 95-96, 97
Chinese-American Students, 16
Civil engineering department, 3-4
Clark County School District, 2
Computer Users Board, 14
Computerized Registration Committee, 14-15
Computing center, 1-2
Coray, Michael, 86, 87, 89
Council on the Arts, Nevada State, 111
Cufflin, Crispian L., 58

D

Desert Research Institute, 4-5, 112
Dodson, John, 121
Donehower, Grace, 73, 78-79
Drugs, 82-83

E

Elko, Nevada 64-65
Energy crisis, 35-37, 89-97
Engineering, College of, 1, 2, 3-5
Engineering, Dean, 1, 5
Ethnic Studies Program, 86

F

Faculty, 19, 32, 38, 47, 53-54, 60-61, 64, 66, 71, 74, 75, 77, 119, 120
Faculty Senate, 12, 17, 32, 47-49, 51, 53, 56, 72, 73, 76, 79, 102, 105, 116
Flack, JoDeen, 12, 47-49, 77
Fleischmann Foundation, 111-112
Food services, 100

G

Graduate School, 2-4, 10

H

Hattori, Henry, 106, 116
Health Science Committee, 101
Health services, 100-101
Home Economics, School of, 34-35
Hug, Procter, Jr., 82, 83, 84
Human Relations Board, 86
Humphrey, Neil, 7, 15, 32-33, 62, 112

I

Institutional Studies and Budget Committee, 12-13

Intercollegiate athletics, 8, 67, 106, 107-108
Irwin, Ralph A., 5, 20, 31

J

Jacobsen, Harold, 68, 69-70
Jessup, K. Donald, 64
Jot Travis Union, 100, 121
Joyce, Nedra, 66
Judicial College building, 67
Juniper Hall, 99-100

L

Legislature, Nevada State, 20, 27, 108, 117
Lilly, Luella, 107
Lintz, Joseph, Jr., 88
Lombardi, Louis E., 65-66

M

Malone, John, 108-109
Malone, Robert, 81
Manhart, Robert A., 54-55
Mathematics department, 2-3
Mayer, Tom O., 57-58, 113
Mexican-American (Chicano) students, 16
Milam, Max, 18, 37-38, 39, 43, 101, 113, 115-118, 122
Miller, N. Edd. 5, 6-7, 8, 14, 17, 22, 26, 29-30, 40, 41, 49, 72-73, 105, 110, 111, 120
Miller, Tippy, 80
Mordy, Wendell, 4
Morrill Act (U.S. 1862), 98-99
Morris, William W. "Wildcat," 67
Morse, Charlotte, 80, 85-86, 87-88

N

N. Edd Miller Day, 7-8
Nevada Vocational Manpower
Advisory Board, 15
Newton, John, 85, 86, 87,
88

O

Olsen, Edward A., 104
"107 committee" (of Facul-
ty Senate), 12, 98

P

Palmer Engineering build-
ing, 92
Parking, 53-55, 58
Parking and traffic board,
54-55, 57
Pearson, Len, 101
Physical Plant building,
91
Pine, Edward L., 36-37,
55, 81, 106
Police, 80-82, 83, 84
Presidential Search Com-
mittee, 114-115
Press relations, 44-45,
50, 70, 102-104, 108
Public Relations, 16, 20,
24, 26-29, 44-45, 103

R

Rasmussen, William E., 85
Regents, Board of, 7, 21,
33, 47-48, 49, 51-52, 53-
54, 56, 57, 60-63, 64-
70, 75, 76, 77-78, 89,
97, 108, 111, 114, 117,
119
Regents Special Projects
fund, 113-114
Research, 96, 99
Residency Appeal Board, 14

Reynolds, Terry J., 51-53,
54, 55, 56-57, 58, 59,
77, 100-101
Rockenbeck, Margaret, 101
Ross Business Administra-
tion building, 77
"Rules and Disciplinary Pro-
cedures for members of the
University Community," 14
Rusco, Elmer, 86, 87, 89

S

Scrugham Engineering and
Mines building, 1, 2-3
Special Services, 86, 88
"Spirit of '76," 114
Staff Employees Council,
116
Steninger, Mel, 64-65
Stone, Bradford Jay, 101
Streaking, 97-98
Student government, 8, 16-
17, 32, 47, 51-59, 72,
76, 77, 79, 100, 108,
113-114
Student housing, 99-100
Students, 62, 71, 72, 75,
79, 97, 100, 113, 114,
119, 120
Students, dean of, 16
Student Services, 101

T

Tenure, 69-70
Thompson, Helen, 66
Thorne, Nadine, 80
Tripple, Patricia A., 34
Twenty-to-one (student-
faculty ratio), 11-12

U

University budget, 9-13, 23,
64, 86-87, 98-99, 106, 107-
108
University of Nevada, Las Ve-
gas, 2, 11, 12, 13, 66,
67, 112

University of Nevada Sys-
tem, 60, 63, 64, 66,
109, 112
Upward Bound, 80-86, 87-88

V

Van Tassel, William, 4

W

Washoe County School Dis-
trict, 2
Western Nevada Community
College, 2, 12, 13, 48-
49, 65, 67, 112
Whalen, Brian, 81
Wolf, Harry, 84-85, 86, 88,
89
Wolfpack Boosters Associa-
tion, 50, 105
Women's athletics, 104-
108
Women students, 4

FOR REFERENCE ONLY